



No. 94 MAY 1976

Spearhead

15p

BRITISH DEFENCE: TIME FOR NEW THINKING

(SEE PAGE 10)

Nationalist comment

WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

Behind it all

"Before the killing gets worse, as it will, there is still time for Mr Chamberlain to make one more supreme effort to pressure the Poles into coming to terms with German reality in Eastern Europe. If Neville Chamberlain interprets the occupation of Czechoslovakia correctly, that is what he must surely do."

Can one imagine reading a newspaper editorial like that in the autumn of 1939? Of course not. 'Appeasement' was cowardly and out of the question. Every editorial in every British newspaper cried out for taking up arms in defence of the Poles. The British government rushed headlong to offer a guarantee to Poland that it could not honour, and for the sake of a country which did not concern us in the slightest Britain plunged into a world war that shattered our Empire and ruined Europe.

Yet this was a *Daily Mail* editorial last month: "Before the killing gets worse, as it will, there is still time for Mr Vorster to

make one more supreme effort to pressure Mr Smith into coming to terms with black reality in Rhodesia. If Johannes Vorster interprets the three murders on the Beitbridge road correctly, that is what he must surely do".


It makes one think that the world has gone completely insane. In 1939 we were prepared to launch a world war over a squabble in eastern Europe between Germany and Poland that was irrelevant to Britain. In 1976, however, the Rhodesians, **our own people**, British people — they can go to hell. Our newspapers and our political leaders have done nothing but call for the abject appeasement of black savagery and the total surrender of our white Rhodesian kinfolk. Incredibly, there has not been a single call from a British political party, politician or newspaper for the military defence of Rhodesia. Not one. Instead we give £15 million in aid to Rhodesia's enemies.

What is one to make of this insane, unbelievable contrast — suicidal world wars for irrelevant causes and the most blatant betrayal of the cause of our own people? Can it possibly be that our politicians are simply fools, who are leading the British people to disaster by making gigantic blunders of global policy merely out of stupidity? Is that really credible? Or is there a design behind it all?

To paraphrase somewhat the words of Senator William Jenner: "What will be left of the British system when we have fought world wars for nothing, shattered the Empire, and abandoned our own White kinfolk throughout the world? I do not know — but SOMEONE knows..."

Friends of Majority Rule

Is that someone Henry Kissinger? Or somebody like him?



HENRY KISSINGER
Aiding communist ambitions

Kissinger is to tour Africa and emphasise that America is the best friend of present and future black leaders. He intends to make it clear that 'American' policy fully supports majority rule and entirely disassociates itself from resistance by Rhodesia and South Africa to black take-over.

Black take-over in southern Africa, of course, means communist take-over, direct or surrogate, and that in turn means an outright threat to the West through Soviet control of the vital sea lanes to Europe. Yet American policy is supposed to be anti-communist, and to be concerned everywhere with halting the communist advance. Kissinger, however, is a friend of black rule.

Is Kissinger, then, a fool? Is this another example of political stupidity and blundering? No, for the subtle Dr Kissinger knows perfectly well what he is doing, and what he is doing is aiding and abetting the global ambitions of communism. Kissinger knows that, wherever the white man has retreated in the world, communism has moved in, yet everywhere he has been the architect of Western withdrawal in the face of communist aggression. Kissinger knows that Soviet policy is black take-over in southern Africa — and that is his policy too.

It is further proof that there is a design behind it all, and that this design is explicable only in terms of an alliance between communism and top-level Western policy makers. If something that can only be in the interests of communism is deliberately connived at by someone as shrewd as Dr Kissinger, then it must also be in the interests of the mysterious Doctor and his friends.

Powell on mugging

Enoch Powell has once again followed the National Front, this time by stating that mugging is a racial crime. An "alien implant",

S P E A R H E A D

No. 94 MAY 1976

Office: 91 Connaught Road, Teddington, Middlesex (Tel: 01-977 2452)

Publisher: John Tyndall

Editor: Richard Verrall B.A. Contributing Editor: Martin Webster

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its founder and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.

he declared, had reduced a community that was once homogeneous to a divided, violent society in which self-identifying groups were growing apart "because of their inherent natures". As a result of the massive "introduction of these alien wedges into the population of our cities there is not the slightest prospect of a community attitude growing up in the future".

All very sound. But what does Mr Powell propose should be done about it? Like many an academic, Powell is able enough to perceive the cause of a problem, but ill-equipped to offer a solution. In the last analysis he is no different from the impotent word-mongers on the so-called 'right-wing' of the Tory party, who have always burred sound without substance on every issue from the Common Market to Rhodesia.

What point is there in an expert diagnosis if the necessary cure is not recommended? Powell prides himself on being a logician. And the logical solution to the problem of social disintegration brought about by coloured immigrants, which Powell admits cannot be reversed while they are here, is to remove the immigrants. This can only be done through total and obligatory repatriation, yet Powell has never advocated anything but voluntary repatriation, which is about as logical as voluntary trials for criminals.

Once a political problem has been grasped, it can only be solved by a bold and forthright policy which gets to the root of that problem. Tinkering with voluntary repatriation is no different in kind from tinkering with schemes to improve "community relations". That Powell is a political tinkerer marks him indelibly as part of the tired and outworn establishment.

Subtleties of subversion

Last month the left-wing dominated National Union of Teachers called for a ban on 'sexist' story books such as the well-known Janet and John series which shows boys in adventurous roles and girls helping their mothers with cooking and housework. They warned that such stories were probably illegal, if you please, under the Sex Discrimination Act, and that school governors who kept them could be taken to court. Left-wing extremists in the NUT also called on schools to scrap courses which suggested that girls were weaker than boys, and intend to ask publishers to stop printing books which give this impression.

All this may be dismissed as a bout of mild lunacy worthy of nothing but a derisory laugh, and that was in fact the reaction of the media. But we believe it represents something more sinister. Communist theoreticians expounding on subversive methods have specified that Western society is to be softened and rotted by undermining cohesive, traditional mores and institutions, confusing the minds of young people and fomenting attitudes of being exploited and discriminated



The horrors of Fascism: scenes from a Janet and John Book

against in as many sections of society as possible.

What conceivable point could there be in eradicating the obvious truth that women are weaker than men, that male and female have biologically-based inclinations, the latter to childbirth and motherhood? What advantage is there in obscuring sexual differences and dehumanising the distinct qualities of manhood and womanhood? None at all. But a whole generation raised in such a climate would be a generation confused and demoralised, envious and resentful — one more crack in the crumbling fabric of Western culture.

Breaking the bankers' power

Economist Peter Jay is to be commended for his proposal that an independent Currency Commission should be appointed to regulate the growth of the money supply, relating this to growth in the productive potential of the economy and thereby maintaining a stable general price level that would prevent both inflation and deflation. Such a Commission, he suggests, would be independent of the banking system and of the government (in effect, the same thing).

Of course, Mr Jay's proposal, endorsed also by the Economic Research Council, will receive probably a minute fraction more attention than that given to the National Front's advocacy of the same policy for many years, which is none at all. Attempts to promote such reform by pushing it through the present corrupt political establishment, completely dominated by the vested interests of the bankers is a futile waste of time.

Reforming the banking system is something that is going to require a gigantic and wholesale transfer of political power, which can only be carried out through the assumption of a nationalist government with the will to break the immense power of the private banking fraternity and the political control which it wields. That is the reason why such obviously effective reforms are not carried out by the main establishment parties; they were all bought long ago, and their

functionaries are nothing more than the paid pimps of international finance.

Catering for Lyon

The removal from office of the obnoxious Alex Lyon was greeted with dismay by the thousands of immigrants who benefitted from his warped obsession with turning Britain into an Asian dumping ground.

"I have paid the price of trying to get justice for the blacks in this country", whined the disgusting Lyon.

There was once a time when British politicians believed it their duty to serve only the interests of the British people, and to devote their services unswervingly in the cause of the British nation. But that was a long time ago. We now have the spectacle of a British politician who openly admits to regarding himself as the servant of the world's coloured millions.

Existing treason laws relate only to harming the security of the Realm by working for foreign powers, as distinct from foreign hordes provided with bogus rights of citizenship. However, a future government might well feel disposed to make slight adjustments to cater for the likes of Mr Lyon.

BACK ISSUES AVAILABLE

We have a considerable number of back issues available at the moment dating back to issue No. 79 (Sept/Oct. 1974). To clear these we are offering them at specially reduced prices. These are:—

20—49 copies:	6p each
50—99 copies:	5p each
100—249 copies:	3p each
250 copies and over	2p each

These are real bargains. Order your copies now. Postage should be estimated on the basis of 2 oz. per copy. We cannot dispatch copies if money for postage is not sent.

Orders to: 91 Connaught Road, Teddington, Middx. (Tel. 01-977 2452).

What about this, Brother?



PHONEY CONCERN FOR OLD FOLK

WE hear a lot about the plight of old people, about their loneliness and poverty from Socialists and other left-wingers who fancy themselves as the only people who 'care'.

But did you ever hear a Socialist express concern at the kind of loneliness in this picture? This is the loneliness of countless thousands of British old folk who now feel that they are living in a foreign country, with no one of their own kind to talk to and with whom they can feel at home. We hear a lot from Jack Jones about the right of the elderly to live in comfort — but what about the comfort of living out one's remaining years among one's own people? Isn't that a right, too?

Jack Jones proposes that pension rises should come from the profits on North Sea oil. Fine. But why have we never heard anything from trade union leaders about the millions of pounds of Government money diverted from our own people and lavished on coloured immigrant parasites? That would raise a pension or two!

JACK JONES
Never a word
about immigration



THE RECENT demand by Jack Jones for a massive increase in old age pensions would be admirable were it not just another round in the campaign by the "labour movement" to ingratiate itself with workers and the public at large. The same applies to all the hot air from trade union leaders about unemployment. Neither Jack Jones nor any other trade union leader *has ever uttered a word against coloured immigration*. And yet it is coloured immigration that represents the most disgraceful betrayal of both British old folk and the British worker.

HOT AIR ON UNEMPLOYMENT



THIS is a section of a dole queue — and out of nine people, three are coloured immigrants. With 1½ million people now unemployed, British workers have to compete with immigrants for jobs at a time when the Race Relations industry is ensuring that preferential treatment is given to blacks. Not a word from Jack Jones or the TUC about that.

It is a national disgrace that at a time of the highest unemployment since the 1930's even one alien immigrant is taking home a pay-packet. How can that possibly be justified? Yet Mr Jones and the TUC have never once protested. Indeed, when the National Front marches under the banner of "British Jobs for British Workers", left-wing elements in the trade unions are quick to join the Indian Workers' Association and similar bodies in opposition to the NF. And they claim to be concerned about Britain's unemployed!

Media Zionists show their hand

NOW that April 1976 is behind us and can be compared with April 1975, it will be noted that a new annual tradition has been born.

Zionist media manipulators have, by their actions over two years, designated April as NATIONAL SMEAR THE NATIONAL FRONT MONTH!

In April 1975, it will be remembered, we were treated to the glib and smarmy tones of Zionist M.P. Paul Rose on B.B.C.'s *The World at One* and Thames Television's *Today* "exposing" the activities of a neo-Nazi cult group.

In shocked and solemn sentences which indicated that democracy-as-we-know-it was in imminent danger of being crushed under the jackboot, Rose revealed that as many as one or two dozen blood-thirsty fanatics get together on 20th April (in secret and at dead of night!) in order to stand around a big swastika-shaped cake to sing "Happy Birthday Dear Adolf!"

The whole *exposé* was quite unbelievably silly – but the respectful tone of the journalistic toe-rags (trained, from earliest youth, to grovel before Zionists) who interviewed Rose was calculated to convey to listeners and viewers that the whole thing must be taken with deadly seriousness.

NF NOT INVOLVED

Even though the National Front had no involvement whatsoever with the silly Hitler birthday celebrations, Rose found every opportunity to mention the name of the National Front in gratuitous reference to "the extreme Right".

At one stage Rose agreed that distasteful though many would find the Hitler birthday festivities, the functions did take place in private places for the benefit of invited guests only and that they were not unlawful.

Since when, then, did the bizarre antics of a tiny handful of cranks merit hushed-breath *exposé* treatment? If a small group of hard-line Communists had been found secretly celebrating Stalin's birthday (and Stalin killed many millions more people than Hitler), would Right-of-Centre Christian M.P.'s be invited to discuss the matter on Radio and television? I submit they would not.

Consequently it may be seen that the Hitler birthday party story was not "news" by any objective journalistic acid-test, but

because the massively powerful Zionist movement (which has infiltrated from top to bottom every section of the media its members do not actually own) decree that it should be "news".

ZIONIST OBJECTIVES

The Zionist objective was and is three-fold:—

- 1) To smear the British nationalist and racist cause in general and the National Front in particular – especially just prior to the annual local council elections.
- 2) To keep ordinary Jewish folk in a constant state of hysteria and stampede, so that they could be more ruthlessly squeezed for the continual flood of huge financial donations which the Zionist movement needs to keep Israel afloat.
- 3) To persuade "dumb Goy" Parliamentary politicians that there is a need for even more repressive Race Relations legislation which would have the EFFECT (as opposed to the declared INTENTION) of rendering public criticism of Zionist Jewry a criminal offence!

This year, the Zionists' April propaganda spree was a bit more credible as they claimed to have evidence that the neo-Nazi group which they exposed last year as celebrating Hitler's birthday also engaged in para-military exercises (at least 20 of them – people, not exercises!)

COMMUNIST SPY

This information was brought to light by a self-confessed Communist. The spy was put to work by an old friend of *Spearhead* readers, Gerry Gable – a former 62 Group thug who graduated to "research journalism", which prompted him to engage in Watergate-style break-ins at the private homes of authors and historians whose fields of research are a potential embarrassment to the Zionists.

The spy first infiltrated the Birmingham Branch of the National Front. He found no NF activity worth reporting. He was then instructed to drift out of the NF and team up with two men who had been expelled from the NF on account of what Birmingham NF organisers found to be their "extremist conduct".

Using the two mugs as cover, the spy drifted into Column 88 circles. It was not the Zionists' intention to 'blow' his story for quite some time, but as fate would have it,

he and his two mates were charged and convicted with a conspiracy to assault an Indian waiter, so the whole story of his spying activities came out.

Therefore the Zionist 'spymasters' had to make the best use of such information as had been collected thus far. As with last year's 'birthday party' *exposé*, journalists were briefed to smear the NF by association with Column 88.

As the Column 88 para-military story broke by accident, and we we know that the Zionist propaganda network is now organised to provide a treat every April, what was the story they had planned to promote?

All the signs are that they planned to have a "Life Among the Leadership of the National Front" story to use in the *News of the World*.

NEWS-OF-THE-WANDSWORTH

This story was set up by Bernard Jordan who, from the look of him, may well have reasons for wishing to support the Zionist cause. Prior to joining the *News of the World* he was P.R.O. at the London office of the European Movement (executive head, Zionist Ernest Wistrich).

He arranged for a young lady "investigator" who called herself Christine Dalglish to join the NF via its Wandsworth Branch. She made herself popular in all sorts of ways – and was always ready to flip fivers out of her purse for rounds of drinks or for collections.

After meetings she "threw" herself at speakers like a rock music 'groupie' – and was obviously very anxious to make friends at the top of the NF. When her conduct was related to the fact that she said she had no job, but was "kept by my father", the opinion was expressed that she was probably a spy.

That assessment was given to her by phone early in March (just as a joke, actually) by a young Wandsworth Branch member.

A few days before the NF Bradford march late in April the member told me "I haven't seen Christine for weeks. Do you think I upset her by kidding her you thought she was a spy?"

She was upset, all right – and so was Bernard Jordan!

Instead of being able, as had been planned, to expose the NF "at the top", he had to content himself with writing a muddled and largely untrue *exposé* of its Wandsworth Branch!

The mess-up of the infiltrations in Birmingham and in Wandsworth all go to show two things:—

Firstly, what elaborate, expensive and long-term pains the Zionists will go to in order to smear the National Front.

Secondly, how even the best laid plans of mice and Zionists can often go astray!

(For a post-script to this survey of Zionist propaganda tactics, turn to the 'Troubleshooting' column in this issue.)

Counter-thoughts on Solzhenitsyn

IN HIS translated broadcast on Radio 3 on March 24th, Solzhenitsyn undoubtedly made some eminently valuable pronouncements which can stand any amount of repeating. For these one has only praise, and satisfaction that they were allowed to be heard on Establishment media.

On the other hand it would be a little premature to make extravagant claims for his overall value in the cause of freedom. In spite of having made an extremely useful contribution in some directions, Solzhenitsyn seems to have sadly missed the point elsewhere. (I use the term 'seem' to make due allowance for any omissions or amendments that might have been imposed upon him by the B.B.C.).

"For some 20 years", he says, "Britain's voice has not been heard on our planet". A great deal of what Solzhenitsyn has recently been saying has indeed been said many many times by British nationalists over the past ten years and more, but whilst this Russian has been given a moderately generous audience in the West, exaggerated attempts are perpetually made by the Establishment and media to ensure that Britons, who have been saying similar things for much longer, are not heard. If Solzhenitsyn has observed this, and if it has occurred to him to wonder why he has been specifically favoured, he gives no obvious indication of doing so.

The hallmark of real greatness is to give credit where it is due. He has not done so, (allowing for the above proviso).

Solzhenitsyn comments that when Herbert Morrison prevailed on *Pravda* to allow him a complete page to make his utterances, it was only allowed because nothing Morrison had to say could offer the smallest crumb of encouragement to the enslaved Russian people. It seems to have escaped Solzhenitsyn's notice that he too would have been prohibited from saying most of what he has said in the West if his words had not contained a fairly generous helping of consolation for the principal instigators of the very situation he denounces. One such consolation, though by no means the only one, is undoubtedly the fact that he is a Russian and not a British nationalist.

Solzhenitsyn poses this riddle: how is it that people who have been crushed by the sheer weight of slavery, (Russians like himself), can find the strength to rise up to free themselves, first in spirit and then in body, while those who soar unhampered over the peaks of freedom, (modern Britain?), suddenly lose the taste of freedom, lose the will to defend it, and almost begin to crave slavery? While this is indeed a fair appraisal

of the contradictions that prevail in human society, he has not obviously appreciated that the former situation is partly true of Britain also, whilst the latter, in certain salient respects, is quite the reverse.

In other words, he refers to Britain and the West as though they were totally free when they are not, and as though there were no movement of national resurgence, such as the National Front, rebelling against that loss of freedom. We might therefore be forgiven for asking: Is Solzhenitsyn just another example of an Establishment safety valve, or a means of trying to kid the public that no such movement, or even the need for it, exists in Britain? Is it ignorance on Solzhenitsyn's part: has he been censored for motives opposed to those ostensibly his own?

BRITAIN BLAMED

His broadcast was heavily loaded with insinuations of a slightly questionable nature. For instance, I got the feeling that he was trying to infer that because Britain was once universally respected we must henceforth take the blame for all the world's misfortunes. Nations which never earned themselves any respect are of course relieved of all responsibility. We are familiar enough with this contradictory approach, but it usually reaches us from the left.

While in no sense seeking to mitigate the blame on British rulers for any blatant acts of betrayal, such as at Yalta, one can hardly go as far as agreeing that it was Britain's duty to send an army to Russia to liberate their people from enslavement by their own rulers. While Solzhenitsyn falls short of actually stating he thought this was Britain's duty, the inference seemed to be there.

He indulges in tricks of speech typical of his avowed Socialist enemies in their attempt to engender a guilt complex in the British people.

"Nor did **you** shrink" he says, "from using the butts of **your** rifles on 70 year olds" (Russians). "... **You** (decided that **you**) should close your eyes to a great many things — **you** should forget Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, **you** should hand over six more of your European sisters into slavery — and at Nuremberg **you** should sit amicably side by side with judges who were every bit as much murderers as those on trial," etc. (My emphasis).

It hardly sounds as though these remarks are addressed to the scheming liberal leftist Establishment that has been the cause

of dragging our nation down and down and down. It sounds much more as though he is speaking to the ordinary, well meaning Briton who has been brainwashed out of his very existence.

I wonder how Solzhenitsyn would react if we were to respond, perfectly fairly, to his jibes by saying: "Yes, but it was **you** and not we who actually butchered 110 million of your own fellow countrymen — **you**, not we who occupied and enslaved half of Europe, so who are **you** to preach to us?"

Would he then round on us indignantly and say: "Oh, but it was not I who did all that. It was the tyrannical Soviet government," with the inferred addendum "from which it was your duty to liberate us"? If so, one can only smile at his reluctance to concede that what is good for the goose is good for the gander.

SUBTLE DICTATORSHIP

Fresh from the iron fisted Soviet dictatorship, this Russian has failed to acknowledge the subtle, hypocritical form of dictatorship with which we are beset, failed to acknowledge the distinction in the West, (as in Russia), between rulers and people, failed to acknowledge the disguised alliance between the rulers of both worlds which militates against the peoples of both worlds.

If there was one outstanding clanger that really stood out beyond all else like a Russian bear with a sore thumb, it was surely embraced in his comment: "Then your country manifested incomparable daring — against . . . Iceland, against . . . Spain, countries which could not even answer you back." What a painfully ill-conceived comparison, to place the defence of British fishing trawlers on the high seas against attacks by Icelandic gunboats in the same category as the withdrawal of Britain's Ambassador from Spain on account of that nation's having justly executed terrorists known to have committed murder.

One might, in any case, ask how it is that a nation that Solzhenitsyn describes as of less significance than Rumania or Uganda could be appreciably too powerful to be answered back by Iceland. The one view that might not have surprised us is that Iceland has been answering Britain back only too vigorously.

The abyssmal extent of this clanger was amply confirmed on another wavelength later that same evening by Establishment hack Bernard Levin. He was overwhelmed, so he said, by the wisdom of all Solzhenitsyn had had to say. Then, as if one could not have predicted it, he singled out one item and one only for his special praise. It was of course the Russian's contempt for Britain's behaviour towards — wait for it . . . Iceland. Nothing about Spain of course. Not a word.

Needless to say, those who had not earlier tuned in to Radio 3 would logically assume that the comment about Iceland typified the theme of Solzhenitsyn's whole broadcast.

ALTHOUGH "Age Action Year 1976" was announced by its sponsors in October 1975, we are now into May of the operative year and there has been no noticeable publicity for it in the mass media. However, judging from their pre-campaign release, it does not appear that their programme includes any attempt to obtain for the pensioner any increase in the retirement pension, or a better and less costly pension system.

It is my case that if the government were to pay a realistic tax free and all in basic pension, upon which the person could live with a reasonable degree of comfort and independence, there would be a saving in both the supplementary pensions department of the DHSS, which in itself would release personnel to investigate more thoroughly those other claims on the funds by layabouts, drug addicts, immigrants, and people who in many other ways are drawing Social Service benefits under false pretences. It would also relieve the ratepayer of some of those extra benefits that are now provided through the local authority.

I have just been reading the answers to Jack Jones' plea for another increase in the retirement pension, which would bring the last increase up to the £6 awarded to the working members of our society. Brian O'Malley, Minister of State for Health and Social Security, is reported as saying that: "The TUC's suggestion would mean raising another £4,000 million, an average of £160 a year, or more than £3 a week for each working member of the population". Patrick Jenkin, (Conservative spokesman on pensions), uses very much the same line, and quotes the same figure of £4,000. Professor Peter Townsend does say that he "would like to see a specific government undertaking to move up to a level of single pension which would, say, be about 25%, in the first instance, of average male industrial earnings and then perhaps up to 30% later on".

But in answer to the question: "What do you think of a call for 33%?", he says that "he doesn't think that anybody who proposes more at this stage should be allowed to get away with it without actually committing themselves about what would actually happen to other rates of benefit".

These are quotations taken out of context, I know, but they do tend to reveal that the priorities of such people are biased against the pensioner and that they do not understand how industrial agreements of recent years have made the older aspects of the National Insurance and National Assistance Acts obsolete.

The first reply that I would make to Messrs O'Malley and Jenkin is that they had no difficulty in finding the money when it came to increasing the salaries of themselves and their parliamentary friends. In fact, not only were their own salaries raised, but every kind of allowance that they have voted themselves throughout the years was also raised. And when a man's salary and expenses are already generous (and partly tax free), it

A. R. DRANE

Our Pensioners: a Nationalist priority

is no excuse for getting more to say: "We haven't had the increases we should have had in order to maintain the differentials between us and other members of society". In the first place, this is precisely the argument of the pensioner, who is being denied those increases which would maintain the most meagre standard of living. This line of reasoning is also exactly that for which they condemn the worker in industry.

SICKNESS CLAUSES OBSOLETE

Moreover, the Contracts of Employment Acts have made the Sickness Benefit clauses of the original acts quite obsolete. There are now few full-time workers whose contract of employment does not include some allowance for payment during periods of sickness, yet a worker producing a Doctor's Certificate can, after three days, still draw full sickness benefit irrespective of whether his contract of employment allows him to draw full or partial wages during the whole or part of the sickness period.

There is no means test on a sick benefit claim to ensure that the claimant hasn't other forms of income (i.e. Insurance or Club benefits) such as are applied to the pensioner when he or she applies for supplementary benefits. Yet there is no argument about the fact that the retirement pension does not provide for any human being sufficiently to live, without the addition of some supplementary benefits.

No one in their right mind ever visualised the funds of the Social Services being used to supplement strike pay when the scheme was first founded, and even though I have never met a worker who begrudged paying into the funds for sickness, unemployment and retirement benefits, I most certainly have met those who regard it as wrong.

One could go on giving examples of those whose case seems to be given priority over the pensioner, and in some of these cases the people concerned have never paid one penny into the funds from which the benefits they claim are paid. One instance that can be quoted is that of the Student, who not only claims that the grant given him whilst at the place of study is not adequate to maintain him, but who also claims Social Security directly upon the vacation. I happen to live in an area where there are a high proportion of students among the young people, and they appear to have sufficient money to pack the local pubs at week ends. There is no possible doubt about when they

are on vacation! Even the few drug addicts that I know appear to be able to afford their drinking schools, and one would believe that they had ample money by the price of the rounds they can buy.

Then one may cite the "Squatters" as another instance. I am told that as long as they can provide an address as their own residence they can draw Social Security, and this must surely include the rent they claim to be paying. Does anyone ever check to find out whether they are paying rent? Yet a pensioner drawing supplementary benefits is subject to the means test, and widowed younger women and single parents (female) are subject to the "SNOOP". Even the illegal immigrant is given free board and lodging, medical attention etc until they can be deported (again on a free passage provided from public funds).

IMMIGRANTS PAMPERED

But I think that the most outstanding instance of mistaken priorities is that of the treatment given to legal immigrants. According to our own national press, these people can arrive at Heathrow and they have got to be found accommodation at once. It does not matter if this is in an expensive hotel; they can draw Social Security and have been given priority in obtaining accommodation (even a disused R.A.F. Station's married quarters was opened to them at one time), and the accommodation given them is furnished from floor to ceiling.

Quite frankly, I do not accept that our own pensioners cannot be given any increase in their pension without it having to come from the pockets of the workers and from taxation. I believe, and I think that there are many who agree with me, that a revision of the system and of our priorities would release a reasonable amount of the money, as would the diversion of the aid at present provided for the so-called "developing countries", which have been on our backs for many years without any signs of being self supporting.

If more money were needed, it could be found without any additional out-of-pocket cost to the taxpayer because of the saving in local rates. The National Front should seriously consider as a matter of policy a realistic TAX FREE and ALL IN basic retirement pension upon which a person can live with a reasonable degree of comfort and independence — and without the indignity of the means test.

Reflections on the liberal intellectual

WHY is it that most of our so-called intellectuals are liberal or left-wing? James Burnham has pointed out that liberals are to be found especially among those who are *verbalisers* by profession, that is, journalists, teachers, academics, writers and intellectuals of all sorts. This is undoubtedly true, and I believe that, rather than being prime agents themselves in bringing about the rottenness of our era, 20th century intellectuals, as verbalisers, are people who merely articulate the deep decadence in our society. Our age of death-wish and decline has brought to the fore a particular type of intellectual, for whom liberal doctrines are simply a way of *rationallising* our corrupt and suicide-bent civilisation.

Consequently the age nourishes and encourages the liberal intellectual, and feels compelled to reject the message of those who stand for opposing doctrines – the anti-liberal intellectuals. Yet among these have been many of our finest writers and thinkers. An outstanding example, against which one may contrast the liberals, was the poet T.S. Eliot.

Eliot once described himself as “a classicist in literature and a royalist in politics”, but he was certainly more of a radical in both than his description would suggest. Above all, he was the embodiment of everything that the liberal intellectual is not. All we know about him shows that he entertained the healthiest contempt for “liberal values”. In particular, he entirely lacked that streak of cosmopolitan rootlessness and disdain for racial and national tradition which is the hallmark of the liberal intellectual.

There is no better proof of this than the views he expressed in his lecture of 1932, *After Strange Gods*, in which he analysed the *malaise* of modern society and suggested the ideal conditions which might foster a reversal of contemporary trends.

“Our society”, declared Eliot to his audience, “is worm-eaten with liberalism . . . The struggle of our time is to renew our association with traditional wisdom; to re-establish a vital connection between the individual and the race; the struggle, in a word, against liberalism.”

In this lecture Eliot summarised with brilliant accuracy the fragmenting character of liberal values – the way in which they have demolished the idea of the nation state as a community, of the race as a collective organism, isolating the individual from both of them and leaving him rootless and alienated.

“What conditions, within our power to bring it about”, asks Eliot in his lecture,

“would foster the society that we desire? . . . The population should be homogeneous, where two or more cultures exist in the same place they are likely either to be fiercely self-conscious or to become adulterate . . . I think that the chances for the re-establishment of a native culture are perhaps better here than in ‘New England’. You are further away from New York; you have been less industrialised and less invaded by foreign races; and you have a more opulent soil.”

The homogeneity of race, nation and culture, a preference for unity as against free-thinking fragmentation, a deep affection for the land, the desire to re-establish a native culture – such things set Eliot worlds apart from the intelligentsia of his day. Little wonder that he sought refuge in English citizenship from the multi-cultural Babylon of modern America. His concern with the alienating influence of foreign races and his loathing for the vulgarity of world cities like New York are aspects of a view consistently reflected in his work. Poems such as his *Waste Land* represent 20th century civilisation as a thing of spiritual emptiness and materialism, vulgarised and dominated by the power of money, lacking in faith and heroism, pulled up by its race-cultural roots; a sort of stagnant pond with cosmopolitan scum floating on the surface and hollow, lifeless depths underneath.

LEFTIST UTOPIANS

Unlike his contemporaries in England and Europe, Eliot did not escape from this cultural ruin through utopian socialism, or by privately refining his sensibilities among a clique of intellectual snobs like the Bloomsbury Group, whose dreams of the future centred on internationalism and “citizenship of the world”. He remained possessed of that greatest intellectual stimulant – the sense of rootedness among his own people and his own culture.

In this connection, E.B. Ashton reluctantly admits that the German nationalists’ description of the position of writers like Thomas Mann in German cultural life of the ‘thirties was perfectly correct: they represented a thin layer of internationalised intellectuals, with huge literary or artistic reputations and with no emotional connection whatever with the mass of their fellow countrymen. When they thought about ‘freedom’ it was not for Germany and its people but for “the world”, so indifferent were they to the needs and feelings of their own national community. For fourteen years this so-called cultural *élite* thought to exercise

an influence on the German national consciousness – and then in 1933 found out that the mentality they thought they were leading had been marching in quite another direction.


The same is true in a different form in England. Among Eliot’s English contemporaries, the contemporaries also of Thomas Mann and Bertold Brecht in Germany, were Virginia and Leonard Woolf, Bertrand Russell and Lytton Strachey, Kingsley Martin and Clive Bell. (Eliot himself had some brief contact with this Bloomsbury circle but emerged unscathed). The nature of this coterie, linked by “kinship and by common enjoyment of certain lawns and drawing-rooms”, is described very well by Correlli Barnett in *The Collapse of British Power*: “It was a sheltered world, this of the intelligentsia of the 1920’s, its inhabitants mostly shielded by private means from crude personal reminders of the outside struggle for survival. They circulated at leisure from country house to country cottage – the Bells at Charleston in Sussex, the Woolfs at Asham and Rodmell – back again to Bloomsbury or one of the ancient universities; convinced that they carried in their luggage the soul of civilisation. The memoirs of the epoch are fragrant with cultured weekends – witty chat on the lawn and brilliant profundity at the dining table. It was a circle of flimsy and precious people, of whom Lady Ottoline Morrell was perhaps the manliest”.

The stereotype is familiar. All were members of the leisured, upper middle class; all of them indulging in the luxury of being pacifists, leftist utopians and internationalists. They could not have been more oblivious to the real temper and needs of their own nation, and regarded the rest of their countrymen with icy disdain. After all, how could the peasants possibly appreciate Gilbert Murray’s subtle blend of left-wing Fabianism and Greek philosophy, out of which he developed the ridiculous idea that there was something of Ancient Greece about the League of Nations! The group was characterised by a genteel sort of leftism rather than the more strident note of bolshevism in some of their German counterparts (Barnett emphasises that they were not, as they supposed, the vanguard of a new outlook but the exhausted rearguard of Victorian romanticism), but they belonged nevertheless to the same international *milieu* of concealed, culturally rootless intellectuals.

A SUPER-COSMOPOLITAN

Of course, the quickening pace of Western decline since the war has produced a contemporary intelligentsia even more obnoxious than the woolly utopians of Eliot’s day, and one could select endless examples from the modern array of “relevant” novelists, sexually ambivalent poets, Marxist philosophers and Fleet Street negrophiles.

But let us consider as an example a highly respected liberal thinker and Cam-



FREUD:
Corrosive
influence

underground newspaper. Sartre also expresses a loathing and rejection of his own culture in vitriolic outpourings of ethno-masochism. His preface to Franz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth* is described by Wilmot Robertson as "one of the most vituperative and extensive slurs in the history of racial invective. It is a sign of the times and of the pressures of the times that the most rabid perpetrators of anti-white racism are accepted as respectable members of the white intellectual fraternity".

REJECTION OF THE GREAT

It is an even more remarkable comment on the times that, when we move to grander heights and consider some of the really great minds of this century, we find a sort of compulsion within the age to reject its really fine souls. Think of the fate that has befallen some of our greatest philosophers, writers and artists, those whose life and work are deeply imbued with that very sense of race-cultural rootedness. At random one would certainly name T.S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, Martin Heidegger, the Norwegian novelist Knut Hamsun, Louis-Ferdinand Celine, Richard Strauss, Oswald Spengler and Carl Jung amongst others.

And what of their fate? Eliot — a voluntary exile in England, his views ignored or held in grave suspicion; Pound — the founder of modern poetry, who paid for his lone cries in the liberal wilderness by being exhibited in an iron cage in Italy after the war and incarcerated in a lunatic asylum for twelve years; Heidegger — probably the most important philosopher this century, his thought virtually censored by bigoted academics in America on account of unacceptable political beliefs; Hamsun — persecuted in old age, forbidden to write after the war, incarcerated in a lunatic asylum; Celine — a literary genius forgotten because of political wrong-thinking; Strauss — persecuted after the war, died in exile, Spengler — the proponent of a world historical view vastly more significant for modern civilisation than Marx, yet consigned to obscurity and dismissed as a fascist. Many would include Alexander Solzhenitsyn in this list of rejected prophets.

The liberal Inquisition has also detected heresy in Benedetto Croce, Wyndham Lewis, Henry Williamson, D.H. Lawrence, Theodore Dreiser, Hillaire Belloc, G.K. Chesterton, German writers Guido Kolbenheyer, Emil Strauss, Hermann Hesse, Gottfried Benn and the composer of *Carmina Burana*, Carl Orff. In all cases their sin was some political affiliation or expressed opinion opposed to orthodox liberal values.

Rejection of such great men sometimes takes a petty or more subtle form than the treatment of Pound or Heidegger. Consider the eminent Swiss psycho-analyst Carl Jung, who gave lasting offence to liberalism by studying questions of racial memory and racial archetypes. He argued that the conclusions of a Jewish (Freudian) psychology

could not be taken as generally valid, since the contrast of the Aryan and Semitic racial archetypes expressed itself through fundamental differences in the collective psyche. By now the reader will have grasped why Jung is permanently overshadowed in the blaze of publicity lavished on Freud, whose animalistic doctrines of behaviourism have had such a corrosive effect on Western morality. It is interesting that Eliot, as well as Yeats and D.H. Lawrence, utterly detested Freud.

Great scientists too have not escaped the ban. The brilliant zoologist Konrad Lorenz is under a political cloud, as are Nobel prize-winning physicists Philipp Lenard and Johannes Stark, the latter of whom developed a pre-Relativity electromagnetic theory that still casts doubt on Einstein's ideas. Einstein, of course, has long been canonised as a world genius along with Freud, and his name trumpeted to the four corners of the earth. Whether this has anything to do with Einstein's minority origins and his sympathy for communism (neither shared by any of the above persons) is something not entirely beyond speculation.

HOW TO BE ACCEPTABLE

The truth is that the liberal age is compelled to reject the best of its own, as though its prophets were healthy transplants foreign to a sick body. It is, of course, liberalism which is the alien, transplanted ideology and the root cause of the sickness. In place of these outcasts have come the very worst types, the intellectuals whose instinctual roots have been withered by the liberal disease, and who subvert and undermine their own culture because they no longer belongs to it. It is these people who have stormed and captured every intellectual bastion in Western society, almost unnoticed. They have appointed themselves the spokesmen, and are now presiding over the fragmentation of Western culture and the collapse of its racial morale. None dare challenge them or dispute their dogmas. To most people these days it seems safer and wiser to avoid any suspicion of heresy.

The lesson is clear: if you have a sense of belonging, a sense of cultural tradition and a consciousness of race, if you reject the sickly doctrines of liberalism and levelling and you have something profoundly important to say — better keep quiet. Because nobody wants to hear it and your chances of survival might be limited.

If, on the other hand, you subscribe to the banalities of received leftist opinion and positively despise belonging to anything (except, of course, a minority group or the sea of humanity in general), then you stand an excellent chance, provided you put it all down on paper, of being elevated to the pantheon of modern intellectualism. You might even be crowned with immortality, but there is one thing you certainly will be — acceptable.

bridge academic George Steiner, whose special brand of literary verbiage is supposed to show brilliance of mind, but who would be denounced by any intelligent Englishman (if he bothered to read him or even knew of his existence) as a fraud and a charlatan. Steiner is a disciple of the Boas-school sociologist Claude Levi-Strauss, whose chief claim to fame is to have blended social anthropology with Freudianism. A typical product of this ghastly mixture is Strauss's statement that: "In the language . . . of myth vomit is the correlative and inverse term of coitus and defecation is the correlative and inverse term to auditory communication". This sort of rubbish well illustrates Steiner's intellectual pedigree.

Now Steiner is typical of the liberal intelligentsia; he is the super-cosmopolitan. He detests consciousness of race or nation. He claims to feel no association with any one country, and to have no first European language, feeling equally at home in any of them. In short, Steiner is at pains to show that he has no consciousness of belonging to anything. Except, that is, to his own racial minority. Here he feels very strongly indeed. A vital thread running through his thinking is his belief that persecution of the Jews has stemmed from jealous frustration at superior Jewish idealism — as manifested in Old Testament monotheism, Christianity and Marxism — which Western man has failed to live up to. This must certainly be one of the silliest and most preposterous assertions ever made, though one fawning reviewer actually doubted whether there was anything so "powerfully perceptive" as this idea in Kierkegaard or Nietzsche! Steiner proclaims that man is "equally endowed whatever his race", but he finds no difficulty in reconciling this with his ceaseless expostulation of Jewish superiority.

Here, then, is the archetypal spokesman of Western thought — a rootless cosmopolitan, an internationalist with a soft spot for Marxism, a Boas equalitarian and an anti-racist; but at the same time a fierce minority racist with a deep resentment of the Western culture to which he does not belong. He is the classic representative of what has been called the liberal-minority intellectual. An even more bizarre example is Jean-Paul Sartre, a philosopher evidently so pea-brained that he can proclaim the ant-hill mindlessness of Maoism in a semi-literate

BRITISH DEFENCE

TIME FOR NEW THINKING

PART 1

FOUR YEARS AGO a British-born professor working in the United States produced a document remarkable for its depth of research and even more remarkable in the disclosures it revealed. These disclosures, if thought through to their logical conclusion, must surely revolutionise our thinking on the post-war 'confrontation' between East and West, and all our consequent views on modern strategy, defence and national security.

The professor was Anthony Sutton, who for more than a decade had been researching 'Soviet technology' as a fellow of the Hoover Institution on War and Peace. The result of his researches was first condensed into an article, then expanded into three books. His theme may be briefly described as follows:—

"There is no such thing as Soviet technology. Almost all — perhaps 90-95 per-cent came directly or indirectly from the United States and its allies. In effect, the United States and NATO countries have built the Soviet Union — its industrial and military capabilities. This massive construction job has taken 50 years, since the Revolution in 1917. It has been carried out through trade and the sale of plant, equipment and technical assistance."

Professor Sutton then went on to cite many examples: all the steel technology that goes into the making of Soviet weapons comes from America and its allies, the largest iron and steel plant in the world, situated in Russia, having been built by the American McKee corporation. About two thirds of the Soviet fleet consists of ships built outside Russia, and about four-fifths of the engines for these ships were built outside Russia. The entire complement of trucks belonging to the Red Army, about 300,000, has come from factories equipped by machinery from the United States.

Further statistics, available in abundance, make it clear that the massive Soviet military machine before which we tremble today simply would not exist except through the help of the very Western capitalist world which it is supposed to be mobilised to destroy.

But technical aid is not all. We must then consider the economic implications of Soviet military commitment. It is estimated today that between 40 and 50 per-cent of the entire Soviet national budget is devoted to military spending. This represents between 15 and 20 per-cent of the whole gross national product of the Soviet Union.

Just how can a country devote such an enormous proportion of its national wealth to arms expenditure, year in, year out, in times of peace, without going completely bankrupt and starving its citizens to death?

The answer again is that Russia manages to do so because of constant Western help. As regularly as clockwork over recent years Russia has had a harvest failure which, correctly exploited by her Western adversaries, could have produced a counter-revolution inside her borders and the overthrow of Communism. But instead these Western nations, headed by the United States, have bailed Russia out of her troubles by shipping massive consignments of wheat to her at prices well below current world market prices, and in the process sending prices to the rest of their customers zooming upwards.

Meanwhile Western nations have been running to Russia to help her with especially generous loans. On Harold Wilson's last trip to the Soviet Union he arranged loans from Britain at interest rates appreciably lower than those at which Britain was borrowing money elsewhere.

These facts do not of course represent anything new to serious students of world affairs. The nexus between Western money and Soviet Bolshevism has been a well established reality since the earlier part of our century, with masses of documentary proof of its existence being supplied in the writings of Nesta Webster, Arthur Kitson, C.H. Douglas, A.K. Chesterton, W. Cleon Skousen, Gary Allen, Ivor Benson, S.E.D. Brown and many others.

But the disclosures of Professor Sutton, taken in conjunction with up-to-date facts concerning Western economic help to the Soviet bloc, throw into perhaps bolder outline than ever before the central truth that these facts support: that Communism is not, as is supposed, a revolutionary uprising of the people against Capitalism but a capitalist creation, sustained and nurtured by Capitalism through all its trials and permitted by Capitalism to erect what appears as the most formidable military machine the world has ever known.

The question arising from this is: what is the purpose of this military machine and how are we to react to it?

We may immediately dismiss as unworthy of serious consideration current left-wing thinking on the subject. Such thinking loses itself in a cloud-cuckooland in which the pretence is maintained that no such military machine exists, or that if it does we need not worry about it so long as we continue to pacify the Russian bear with gestures of *detente*.

What we ought to examine more seriously is orthodox 'Conservative' thinking. This may be summed up as follows:—

Soviet military strength poses a real threat to the security of the West. The only way for the West to counter this strength is by the greatest possible unity and integration of forces. The NATO shield must be maintained, with American power as its principal armour. On no account must we encourage American withdrawal from Europe. At the same time we must pursue increasing standardisation of Western defence systems, including production of small arms, tanks, artillery, aircraft, missiles and so on.

The supposition is, in other words, that there are no longer national security considerations, except in the most minor sense; there are only 'Western' security considerations. 'West versus East' is the only conceivable major conflict of the future, therefore 'Western' defence is the only conceivable defence. The integration of Western forces is pursued on the assumption that (a) no independent national defence is possible because no Western nation, apart perhaps from the United States, is strong enough to sustain such defence, and (b) no such national defence is necessary anyway, since the one threat to Western nations is a threat that confronts them as a whole and which therefore they must face as a whole.

This has become the standard strategic thinking of our time, not challenged by any leading military authority in this country or by any established 'right-wing' political spokesman.

Yet if we consider the true background to what now appears as the overwhelming armed strength of the Communist Bloc, this strategic thinking becomes exposed for what it is: sheer, unadulterated baloney.

To begin with, there is the very obvious question: how on earth can there be any political reality in the theory of an East-West 'confrontation' if it has been abundantly proved that military might in the East only exists by virtue of Western technical and financial

aid?

The only conceivable answer that orthodox strategists could give to this question, if they are to sustain the East-West confrontation theory, is that such Western aid to the Soviets has been given foolishly and unthinkingly and that Western capitalists and political leaders have been doing what Lenin predicted they would do, tendering to supply the rope with which the Communists plan to hang them, all out of mere naivety — nothing else!

It should not require much thought to realise that this is an extremely unlikely theory. As Kevan Bleach stated in his admirable article in our last month's issue, the Schiffs and Warburgs, Morgans and Rockefellers of Capitalism are smart. They have not held and do not hold their positions of supreme power through mere short-sighted greed.

And while we have many idiots among the political leaders of the West today they cannot all be such total idiots that they fail to see that one does not provide a foreign power with the technical and financial means to maintain enormous military strength when one regards that foreign power in hostile terms. Just consider the frantic efforts that most Western leaders make today to deny little South Africa the means to arm herself, and you can be sure that these Western leaders are not blind to this elementary rule of strategy.

But let us accept, as a hypothesis, that such idiocy and short-sightedness does prevail in those who control the West and is the only reason for the West's policy of providing the means for Soviet military power. Presumably, such idiocy and short-sightedness would end once that military power was unleashed against the West in an open aggressive war. From that moment on, the Soviets would require to be self-sufficient in the means by which to conduct a full-scale global war. All the evidence is that they would not stand a hope of so being. Within no time their ability to sustain such a vast war effort on their own economic and technical resources would expire. They would be faced with starvation on the home front; their factories would grind to a halt; their weapon technology would soon become obsolete while that of their Western adversaries advanced wholesale.

The only possible preventative to this happening would be the conclusion of a victorious campaign in such a short time that no

such sustained effort would be needed. The Soviets would have over-run the Western world, including the United States, before their existing technology became obsolete and their stocks of weapons, fuel and food ran out.

In that event they would be faced with the job of providing occupying forces to police the whole of Western Europe, North and South America, Africa, Australasia, most of Asia and of course Eastern Europe, as at present — presumably without a free enterprise system to provide the economic stimulus — and for all time, or at least until such moment when the whole of mankind had been induced to love them and submit to them voluntarily!

Such a contingency belongs to the world of fantasy — of Batman exploits or of Jack-in-the-Beanstalk defiance of gravity and logistics. To put it simply, that is not the way things happen in the world in which we live.

Not only is it an absurdity that the men who have risen to the pinnacle of power in the West should unwittingly be providing the Soviets with the means to destroy them; it is an equal absurdity that the men who have risen to the pinnacle of power in the East — and who for the past few decades have scored brilliant successes in the practice of modern *Realpolitik* — should think that the Red Army, sustained only on a Marxist-style economic system, could patrol the entire globe as it now patrols Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, etc.

If we are to descend from these clouds of absurdity to the world of practical politics, economics and military science, there can only be one set of explanations for what is now happening on the international scene. Firstly, the Soviets have no intention of using their military power in an all out war on the West but can only intend to use it as a psychological weapon. Secondly, the rulers of the West know this to be a fact but for their own reasons wish also to sustain Soviet military power as a psychological weapon.

From these explanations arises the inevitable question: is Western policy, at the highest level, identical in its purpose to Soviet policy? And if so, in what does this identity of purpose consist? In the second part of this article next month I shall endeavour, among other things, to answer that question.

THE SYSTEM AND HOW IT WORKS

JOHN TYNDALL's article has dwelt on the extraordinary anomaly whereby Western finance has created and sustained the Soviet menace — as a psychological weapon in the effort to integrate the nations of the West and eventually all nations including the Soviet Union.

Of course, it is necessary that people should remain unaware of all this, and that through the media they should receive entirely false information on which to base their political ideas. Hence the promotion of the bogus "East-West confrontation" theory and similar smokescreens.

Those who are behind the drive for a monopoly of world power have the precise means to promote spurious information through their control of the media and other institutions where ideas are manufactured and sold. The Bilderberg Group, for example, brings not only bankers, politicians and international bureaucrats to its secret meetings but also key media chiefs, academics and journalists. It is here that the 'line' on a

certain matter is laid down and dutifully followed.

Last month a classic smokescreen appeared in the form of a book, *Energy as a Factor in Soviet Foreign Policy*, by Jeremy Russell. This argued that although the Soviet Union will still be dependant on Western technology, energy resources and grain after 1980, she is not really that dependant, and so we cannot use her dependence as a political weapon. Get the message? The book's conclusion was broadly that the Soviet Union does not really need Western aid, and that the purpose of East-West trade is nothing more than a mutually beneficial *detente* arrangement.

ONE WORLDERS

Who published this deceitful book? The Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House. Many will know that this organisation is the British arm of the One

World planners, the equivalent of the U.S. Council on Foreign Relations. Both bodies have Bilderberg links and are financed by the international bankers.

In order that this 'line' should be spread, the *Times* newspaper was used, whose editors, like those of the *New York Times*, *Le Monde*, *Die Zeit* and *La Stampa*, have regularly received their orders at Bilderberg Conferences. The book was reviewed in a 1000 word *Times* editorial which made the line quite explicit. It is no use threatening to withdraw western aid to Russia. She doesn't need it that much. The *Times* went on. "The political purpose of east-west trade is to build up areas of common interest, communication and mutual restraint. It would be another matter if it seemed merely to be contributing to power which was then deployed against Western interests. So far the balance of advantage has been reasonably satisfactory".

Of course, all this must be true. It was in the papers!

The tragedy of the Afrikaner

Reprinted in an abridged form with acknowledgments to THE SOUTH AFRICAN OBSERVER, P.O. Box 2401, Pretoria.

THE TRAGEDY of the Afrikaner people – just like that of the Americans before them – is that they started to decline before they reached maturity.

The decline has all the elements of classical tragedy.

The faster the decline, the higher the elevation of Balthazar Johannes Vorster into a statesman, by all the enemies of our politics of White survival.

There is an established and immutable law as old as Life itself that nations, individuals and political organisms which start to lose faith in themselves and begin to deviate from their true course are already marked with the fatal sign “doomed to extinction”!

That fatal sign appeared on the Afrikaner from the moment Mr. Vorster and the little men around him lost faith in and deserted the traditional principles and policies of their forebears and their people.

Their decline and fall, unless the process is reversed, is a mathematical certainty.

The Romans were not as fortunate as the Afrikaners. They only got bread and circuses. Afrikaners get *detente*, multiracial games, and a brand-new film of the “Sixty Years” of Mr. Vorster’s life.

Much could be written about the Afrikaner people and their political instrument, the National Party. But whatever they had up to the time Mr. Vorster succeeded Dr. Verwoerd as Prime Minister, it was something that had its genesis in antiquity and which had brought them a long way.

They had a keen sense of identity, an instinct to preserve those things that had served well in the past, a prudent love of their traditions, a determination as White men to preserve their racial and national integrity – in other words, a flair for preserving life’s organic unity.

They had not yet learned the latest trick of falling for every vapid phrase that gained momentary currency in the journalistic market-places of the world. They did not succumb as willingly as the liberals, the Zionists and the communists would have them do to every change in the manufactured climate of world opinion.

They still had the nerve to have an opinion of their own.

Their leaders, from Gerald Hertzog to Dr. Malan, Mr. Strijdom and Dr. Verwoerd were men who stood unflinchingly up to world opinion and all its works.

They were great leaders of their people, who articulated and gave practical expression to the deep desire for self-preservation and self-fulfilment that is instinctive in human nature. That instinct is simply the will to live, that distinguishes healthy and living organisms from the diseased and dying.

And today?

CONSERVATISM UNDER CONSTANT ATTACK

The conservatism that once welded Afrikaner culture, church, politics and press into a tight, exclusive unity, that conservatism is now under constant attack from the present leadership of the party.

Today there is no consensus in the party even on such a basic policy as apartheid; and political opinion differs so widely that it is now possible for the party to accommodate thoroughgoing liberals and progressives, whether they speak Afrikaans or English, just so long as they all call themselves nationalists.

The truth to be faced is that Afrikaner nationalism and conservatism are today being systematically undermined and destroyed, together with the traditional National Party, in the process.

The people who started the Afrikaner and the National Party on their death walk – yes, their death walk – and also that of the White man in Southern Africa, are the mini-nationalists and the mini-Afrikaners, including Mr. Vorster, who are no longer willing, prepared or able to stand up to “world opinion” and the forces of the Left.

Material prosperity has blinded them to the reality that people who allow themselves to be cut off from the past find themselves cut off also from the future.

When we of the *South African Observer* express our concern about preserving the National Party as being the bulwark of White survival – and preserving its basic principles and policies – we have not meant the paper on which its constitution has been written.

Our concern has been for the spirit of nationalism and conservatism which had infused the party and its leaders in the past, and without which it cannot hope to survive.

Today, under Mr. Vorster, we see the party fast losing its real character, its idealism and its genius of the past. It continues to possess all its external forms, but less and less of its essence and vitality.

What we are actually witnessing is its very nationalism and conservatism – and the Afrikaner people themselves – being

destroyed by those who have the audacity still to proclaim themselves nationalists.

Meanwhile, the mass of trusting but gullible Afrikaners continue to flock to the polls to keep their present leaders in office, firmly believing that they are still faithfully following in the footsteps of their predecessors!

RACIAL AND NATIONAL SUICIDE

In Dr. Verwoerd’s day conservatives and traditionalists were always secure in their rightful positions as the tone-setters, guardians and leaders of their people. The commercial and new-rich elements were kept in their place, and the liberal establishment effectively kept at arm’s length.

And the position today – nearly ten years later?

With Mr. Vorster as Prime Minister, the liberal establishment is effectively in control of the Party’s policy-making machine; traditionalists and conservatives have been neutralised and silenced; the new-rich Afrikaners have usurped the functions of leadership; cracks widen everywhere in the wall of apartheid; Afrikanerdom is in turmoil; deadliness commercialism has taken firm root among the people; a “black power” movement has emerged and gaining momentum; Harry Oppenheimer today controls almost the entire economic and financial respiration of the country at will, and is well placed to gain eventual political control of all Southern Africa as well; the anti-colonist “wind of change” is blowing strongly through the South African government, and Mr. Vorster is promoting that wind of change as assiduously as Macmillan would have wished; Zionist-Communist equality doctrine has come to be accepted as official policy; we are committed to destroying all forms of “racial discrimination” – and South Africa, with its Vorster *detente* policy, is now poised to abandon S.W.A., in the name of self-determination; to sacrifice Rhodesia on the altar of black majority rule, and, in the process, to commit racial and national suicide herself.

VORSTER TURNABOUT ON RHODESIA

As for Rhodesia itself – our front-line in the real fight against communism – all Mr. Vorster’s efforts and those of his government have continued to be directed towards getting Rhodesia to drop her guard and surrender her White control to the very same forces of pan-Africanism and communist revolution that have taken over in Mozambique and Angola.

His decision to withdraw the South African police was met with surprise and unbelief in Rhodesia. The South African police had already played an active role in the first against terrorism and their withdrawal was made in spite of the many assurances of the South African government.

On August 16, 1973, in Pretoria, he said that the security forces in Southern



VORSTER
Betrayal of principles

Africa must at all times be prepared to fight terrorism, bearing in mind that "the ultimate objective of the subversives" was not only Rhodesia or Angola or Mozambique — but South Africa itself".

Moreover, at the time of the 1974 general election Mr. Vorster stated bluntly: "In fact, the attempt to overwhelm Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique is but a prelude to an attempt on South Africa's sovereignty with the intention of subjugating it".

And the reason for the sudden, complete and quite incredible turnabout on the part of Mr. Vorster? *Detente* suddenly became the touchstone of his premiership, and the Name of his game — the same game of betrayal, sell-out and treason against the White man, which made of him a "statesman" overnight and which he is clearly determined to continue playing, in the name of what he has called the "conscience" of the people of South Africa!

Today, it is not the Kaundas, the Nyereres, the Machels and the Robertos and the other fronts for pan-Africanism and communist revolution in Africa, who are stumbling blocks to Mr. Vorster's whole *detente* policy — they are now the "moderates" and his new partners in *detente* but anti-communist Rhodesia and her White population who refuse to capitulate and

surrender everything they possess and stand for!

But, little do men like Mr. Vorster and those around him seem to realise, or even to care, that the liquidation of the White man and his authority in Rhodesia will also mark the beginning of the liquidation of the White man in South Africa.

They see nothing wrong today in feeding and bolstering, with massive technical and financial aid, a criminal and communist organisation of long standing like Frelimo, whose bestiality and brutality know no bounds; which is dedicated to the breaking down of the White man and his authority in the whole of Southern Africa; and whose murdering terrorists are currently attacking Rhodesia from the East.

Our leaders have yet to learn the moral of the story about the student who created a Frankenstein monster that got quite beyond his control.

GUTLESS APPEASEMENT OF THE ENEMY

The choice before Mr. Vorster was never one between peace and confrontation, as he has sought to make out. We were already at war and had been for the past 20 years, and his only real choice was whether South Africa wanted to *continue* the fight — or else to crawl before its White and Black enemies.

Seeking peace in the name of *detente*, for no other reason than that the price of confrontation is too high, was virtually an announcement of retreat and surrender.

That was also how our enemies in Africa, in Washington, at the U.N., and everywhere else, have interpreted it.

Detente means many things to many people, but the time has come to label it for what it actually is: **plain, old-fashioned, cowardly, gutless appeasement of the communist enemy.**

It means South Africans are not to be given the chance to fight their enemies.

It means, in effect, that we are being sold out **at the top**, and being taken over **from within.**

History repeats itself time and again in the matter of the decline and fall — and death — of nations, because men are so unwilling to face realities and to stand up and be counted. And this is precisely what is

taking place today, with so many Afrikaners unwilling to stand up to Mr. Vorster and face the realities of his policies and his leadership.

We stand today at a critical moment of our history, a vital crossroads. Either Mr. Vorster's leadership will be repudiated, and his policy of *detente* arrested and reversed, or else it will be the Afrikaner himself who will be responsible for allowing Mr. Vorster to write the main chapters in the developing tragedy of the Afrikaner people — and its decline and fall.

We say this as English-speaking South Africans, whose ancestral roots go back to 1960 in the Cape, and who had the privilege of personally knowing — and supporting to the hilt — South Africa's former Prime Ministers, Dr. D.F. Malan, Mr. J.G. Strijdom and Dr. H.F. Verwoerd, and the men of their cabinets, who all stood up as White men, and sacrificed their lifetimes in the cause of the Afrikaner and his nationalist and conservative principles.

READ

National Front News

A broadsheet published monthly in support of the National Front. Subscriptions only for 5 copies or more. 12 issues of 5 copies, £4.08.

Reduced rates for bulk supplies given on request. Send 11½p for sample copy now.

SPEARHEAD FUND

SPEARHEAD is not at the moment able to be self-supporting; it needs voluntary contributions over and above income from sales and subscriptions in order to meet running costs.

Your help would be greatly appreciated. Please make out your postal orders or cheques to Spearhead, and send them to: 91 Connaught Road, Teddington, Middx.

VALERIE BITTNER

THE WEB

We are 'fighting' unemployment and that swine inflation too,
'Racism' and 'sexism' with the clichés tried and true,
Discrimination, deprivation, 'traumatic' things galore,
Only let us know them and we'll add them to the score.

We defy the laws of Nature, 'intellectuals' say they're bad,
And will not cease their onslaught till they have us all quite mad
The politicians' 'fighting' talk on 'evil unemployment'
Sits ill with all their actions on immigrant deportment.

Their battle cries and sorties 'gainst the dragon of inflation
Never scale the ramparts of the cause of its creation,
So the enemy may go unscathed and nameless through it all
For which of those brave warriors dare unmask 'Peter and Paul'.

So let us ever onward, righting wrongs and wronging rights,
To build that great Utopia on which they've set their sights;
And when all are 'liberated', 'integrated', 'harmonised',
The same power, still unseen, will rule us — undisguised.

OLIVER GILBERT

RACE AND DISEASE

The spread of Sick Cell Anaemia

READERS of *Spearhead* may remember an article I wrote about two years ago, pointing out the danger of haphazard blood transfusions involving blood taken from heroin addicts. This was revealed by Dr. Elizabeth Tylden, one of the foremost experts on drugs in this country, who claimed that "blood transfusions from heroin addicts had already proved lethal. Hepatitis is another source of trouble which may be transmitted through medical neglect."

I also pointed out the danger of not keeping blood from white and coloured donors separately. During my research for the article referred to, I asked the chief pathologist at Worthing Hospital if they intended to keep these blood banks labelled with details of race. He was most indignant and said with some heat: "Certainly not. We are not racists here and do not have time for such nonsense".

A few months ago I had to have an operation at the same hospital, so I knew that a blood transfusion would be necessary. When the nurse took a sample of my blood, I asked some discreet questions and she told me I was quite right in my fear of "infection by Sick Cell Anaemia" and that "Negro and White blood is now reserved for their own racial types".

SICKLE CELL ANAEMIA

Sickle Cell Anaemia now infects 2,500,000 blacks in America and is the cause of 1 out of every 4 negro deaths, often before the age of forty. It occurs when a deviated type of hemoglobin is present in red blood corpuscles. The red cells take the shape of a sickle, hence the name. Blood changes then lead to intermittent attacks of acute pain — anaemia with its resultant weakness — jaundice and leg ulcers. Those people who do not have the full disease are just 'carriers'. They may pass it on without having symptoms themselves. Only negroes, inhabitants of South India, the Middle East and the West Indies seem to be mainly affected. It cannot be caught by contact. In carriers of this strange disease, symptoms and anaemia do not show up except under conditions of stress like high altitude airplane flights etc.

Medical advances have not succeeded in finding a cure for this, another disease introduced into our overcrowded country by



HOSPITAL WORKERS IN BRITAIN TODAY
Combating or Carrying Disease?

our black invaders. Blood transfusions and long periods of rest (on the N.H.S. of course) keep them alive, but now that our physicians are learning more about it they are warning carriers who are considering marriage that they run the risk of infecting their children with the disease.

This is another exotic disease introduced into our unhappy country which, like leprosy (figures of leprosy cases are quite unobtainable), was practically unknown here before the first Labour Government signed 'the Black Pact' with Cuba, thereby agreeing to purchase the majority of our sugar from them instead of the West Indies and creating the unemployment in our colonies which started the rot. To cure it they invited the blacks over here.

RACE PREFERENCE

The following statement from a paper read by Dr. Gorman at the 12th Annual Meeting of the American Association of Blood Banks, Chicago on Nov 6th 1959, is highly relevant to this question of race and disease:

"It appears that the farther removed in time men are from a common ancestor, the greater will be the likelihood of difference in the pattern of antigenic factors within their blood group systems. Conversely, it may be assumed that the more closely related individuals are to one another, the less likely are their antigenic patterns to differ. Obviously, this will be more true of inbred or "pure strain families" than in families of diverse ethnic or racial origin.

To reduce this sensitization to the innumerable blood antigens, whenever subsequent transfusions may be necessary, or pregnancy ensue, it is suggested that blood donors should be selected in the following order of preference, whenever feasible:

Selection of Blood Donors for Transfusion Order of preference

1. The patient's own blood "banked" in advance.
2. The blood from an identical twin.
3. Blood from the patient's own blood relatives, providing it is proved compatible by presently accepted methods.
4. Compatible blood from donors of the same ethnic group as the patient.
5. Lastly, blood donors of the patient's own race."

LEPROSY FIGURES

So far as leprosy is concerned, I must alert readers to a sinister decision by the Ministry of Health and Social Security. I refer to their 1970 statement that they are not advising local medical officers to give figures for leprosy in their annual reports, or to any inquisitive reporters.

In their anxiety to hush up these important figures, they forget that some employees of the M. of H. are becoming increasingly disturbed and disclose such facts against higher orders.

In 1968 their consultant on leprosy, after referring to 350 known cases, mentioned the undiagnosed cases which may be "walking our streets to-day and working in our factories".

Cases in 1970 were occurring in Britain at the rate of about one a week. In 1970, 732 cases had been notified since 1951, when the disease was made notifiable. Since then the known cases have escalated in an alarming manner.

If the Government will not stop the unwanted flow of coloured immigrants into our country, the least they can do is to institute proper medical inspection of our unwelcome guests in the interests of public health.

The dark side of a Racist

RACISTS are constantly being ridiculed and smeared by the various organisations that support racial miscegenation. The reason for this is that the views of the integrationists are so unpalatable and spurious that they fear that the public they are trying to dupe will turn to racism which, they admit themselves, has got appeal — far more appeal than their own beliefs can ever have. Besides which, integrationists need to convince themselves that no normal person can be a racist, and that therefore all racists must be idiots of the 'Alf Garnett' variety or social misfits of some kind.

Some of their attempts to ridicule racists are, however, so ludicrous as to make the integrationists themselves look idiots. A splendid example of this is provided by a theory which I first heard about in a television programme some years ago and which I came across again more recently in a magazine article. It doesn't seem to be well known for obvious reasons.

According to this theory there is a dark side to the ego, which is called the 'shadow', wherein all a man's sordid, evil thoughts and abhorrent urges are repressed. In everyday life this becomes personified in the shape of a dark man. Consequently, when a white man of racist tendencies sees a Negro, or anyone of dark complexion for that matter, he sees the embodiment of all his repressed evil fantasies and unspeakable

thoughts. This theory supposedly explains the frequent outbreak of racial violence in America and more recently in Britain. After all, race riots are always started by the whites, aren't they?

This rather strange theory is also used to explain the 'anti-semitism' of the nineteen thirties. Jewish people are frequently represented as being of dark appearance and, as there were very few Negroes in Europe in those days, they thus became the personification of the white man's repressed, evil thoughts and so suffered at the hands of the Fascist and racist organisations active in those days.

Just to emphasise the veracity of this theory a little more, it is pointed out that in the Middle Ages the Devil was known as the "black man". Witches were said to be in league with the "powers of darkness", which presumably goes to prove that the thinking of racists is as backward as that of the medieval Inquisitors and witch baiters.

What this theory is trying to say, then, is that we racists do not oppose coloured immigration into this country because we wish to retain our distinct identity or because of the alien customs and habits of the immigrants, but simply because we have an abnormal fear of people of dark complexions. We are, of course, constantly reminded that over the centuries there have been many

different immigrant racial groups successfully integrated into the community and that the only difference between these and the current influx of immigrants is the "colour of their skin". It is forgotten that during the nineteen fifties, when the immigrants began to pour in from the coloured Commonwealth, we were unable to adequately house or to provide educational and other facilities for the indigenous inhabitants of this country, and that this is one of the main reasons why ordinary people who are called racists oppose coloured immigration.

It seems about time that the integrationists themselves were psycho-analysed, in order to ascertain why they have guilt complexes about events that happened centuries ago in Britain's colonial past; to ascertain why they want to make their own people second class citizens in their own country and why they want to mongrelize the inhabitants of Britain in the unproven belief that it will 'enrich' our society.

Perhaps, on the other hand, it would be as well to let them continue advancing their freakish theories to 'explain' the motivations of racists. There is a saying, "Give them enough rope and they'll hang themselves", which certainly applies to those integrationists who believe that quaint theories like the "dark side of the ego" will help to discredit racialism.

CORRECTION

In our article by John Tyndall in the March issue entitled 'The Jewish Question: out in the open or under the carpet', Mr. Robert Skidelsky, the author of a book on Sir Oswald Mosley, was described as being Jewish. Mr. Skidelsky has written to us to state that this is not true.

Mr. Skidelsky has also stated that there was an error in the wording of one of the passages quoted from his book. In the sentence "What started to change it was the attitude of the Jews themselves . . ." we were in error in including the word 'the' before 'Jews'. The sentence should have read "What started to change it was the attitude of Jews themselves . . ."

We apologise to Mr. Skidelsky for these errors.

Show the Flag

FLAGS, ROSETTES,
POLES ETC.

SEND STAMP FOR LIST

W. BROWN, 20 SUTTON WAY,
HESTON, MIDDX, TW5 0JA

How to obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME

ADDRESS

IF OVERSEAS, SEALED OR UNSEALED

SURFACE MAIL OR AIR MAIL

RATES (12 issues):

British Isles:	£2.58
Overseas surface mail:	£2.52 unsealed
	£4.68 sealed
Overseas air mail:	£4.74 Canada, U.S.A., S. America,
(unsealed)	Africa, Middle East
	£5.34 Australia, New Zealand,
	Far East


Discounts can be obtained

for bulk purchases as follows:—

20—49 copies:	11p each
50—99 copies:	9p each
100—249 copies:	8p each
250 copies and over:	6p each

PLEASE NOTE: These overseas rates apply as above if remittance is by international money order; if remittance is by cheque an additional charge of 25p applies, as our bankers require this as commission for the handling of all foreign cheques.

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: 91 Connaught Road, Teddington, Middlesex.



SIR: From the results achieved by the National Front in the October 1974 General Election, in 90 seats, one can calculate by extrapolation that some 800,000 votes would have been cast for us had we stood in all 635 seats. However, it is not unreasonable to assume that if we contested every seat, a lot of sympathisers who do not vote NF because until now we have had no chance of winning, would vote for us if they saw that we had at least some chance of winning. Therefore, the party should start getting the benefit of these extra votes as soon as we are big enough to field 318 candidates (viz. more than half the total) in a General Election. It is impossible to quantify exactly how big this "vote for size" is, but I would predict that it would at least double our vote and conceivably multiply it four or five fold.

It can therefore be seen that, at the present time, our maximum potential vote in 1976 is somewhere between 1½ million and 4 million, and this is growing all the time of course, year by year. If our organisation in 1976 was sufficiently large, efficient and wealthy to exploit this potential, there is no question that we could command at this moment, 1½ to 4 million votes nationwide. Looking to the future, one can predict that the Liberal Party will become a spent force and decline to a voting strength of only 2 million or so, as the NF takes its place as third party. Since we seem to win support from former Labour and Conservative voters in about equal proportions, we could then go on to become the largest single party by amassing as few as 8 million votes, or 25% of the total. It is therefore seen that we could already be half way to this magic total.

There are two barriers between the National Front and power:

- i) Increasing our organisation to cover every constituency as quickly as possible. We can already cover about 250-300 constituencies.
- ii) Doubling or trebling our present potential vote.

If our rate of growth up to the advent of Mr. Read can be repeated, these objectives could be achieved within 10 years. That we

will be in power by the end of this century is certain. The one thing that will bring it about sooner rather than later is strong party leadership and I am happy that the party now has that vital factor in the person of John Tyndall.

P.J. LINDSAY,
Aylesford, Kent.

SIR: Leftists all over the world are united in condemnation of white rule in Rhodesia. Why? Not because Mr. Smith's rule is inefficient, for obviously no black regime could have built a city like Salisbury or maintained the technically advanced civilization which Rhodesia enjoys.

Nor can it be because Mr. Smith's regime seems less humane than that of Uganda, for example. Even the Left's alleged devotion to "majority rule" does not ring true, as our government's attitude toward Ulster clearly shows. It cannot be disputed that the true cause of enmity toward the Smith regime is the fact that it is a white regime in a land which many black people regard as their home.

There would be no harm in this outlook of the Leftists if only they applied it fairly in other parts of the world. Let us admit that it is quite reasonable for black

people to prefer being ruled by their own kind. All right. But surely it is just as reasonable for English people (white men) to prefer being ruled by their own kindred in their own native land.

"But is there any danger of coloured rule in England?" the Leftist might ask. Most emphatically such a danger exists. Births of white children are decreasing, thanks to birth-control propaganda among the white population. The rate of births in coloured families is not being affected to the same extent and the total of prospective coloured parents in the U.K. is increasing. Unless this tendency is stopped it can only be a matter of time before coloured voters will outnumber white voters in our own native land.

Any honest leftwinger who favours black rule in Rhodesia must also favour a continuance of English rule in England. He must therefore support measures aimed at preventing non-Englishmen from outnumbering our own countrymen on the voting rolls of our land. He must, in fact, support the measures advocated by the National Front. But how many leftists do support us? There must be something wrong with leftist logic!

MAJOR-GEN. RICHARD HILTON.
Buxton, Derbs.

LETTER OF THE MONTH

Spearhead publishes the best letter to the press on National Front policy every month. Send your cutting to us not later than the 15th of the previous month. You could win a £1 Nationalist Books voucher. This month's winner (below) was published in the *Stevenage Mercury*.

A conference of double standards

IN the latest edition of *Network* (the Broadwater, Stevenage, magazine) is a report from the World Council of Churches conference in Nairobi, which highlights the perversion, hypocrisy, double standards and ingratiating one expects from today's religious hierarchy.

We are informed of the black South African pastor who is allegedly banned from white churches, but what is not mentioned is whether he is one of the many black men of the cloth who actively engage in acts of terrorism in that country.

We then hear of the North American minister who, in a despicable act of self-degradation, apologises for his origins simply because his country is rich.

The WCC state that people in rich countries will have to make sacrifices in order that people in poorer countries can have more of the cake. No mention is made of the sacrifices made by the people in the rich countries to enable them to become rich or that the poor countries should use some of their own wit and muscle to help themselves.

For gross hypocrisy and double standards the penultimate paragraph takes some beating. In one breath they state that discussions had taken place regarding religious persecution in Communist countries and then they go on to say that a motion to withhold aid to the Communist-run liberation groups who used violence was heavily defeated. This means that the violence was heavily de-

terrorist groups who torture, mutilate and murder in the name of freedom — Communist-type freedom.

The final and most derisive insult is the reaction of the Bishop of Uganda to the motion to stop this aid, his "frightened silence was poignant evidence of the impotence of peaceful protest under tyranny." Now we all know what a tolerant, humane and multi-racial country Idi Amin's Uganda is.

This is peddled at a time when our kith and kin in Rhodesia are being attacked by these "freedom fighters" who have the blessing of our government.

The National Front are the only party of note who support our friends in Rhodesia and I would urge all those who are sickened by this betrayal of our allies to contact me at 13 Lygrove, Stevenage. Tel: J. L. PELL, 3616 (evenings).—J. L. PELL, NF organiser, Stevenage Group, Lygrave, Stevenage.

Trouble shooting

Postscript to 'Media Zionists'

This column is by way of being a postscript to my main feature in *Spearhead* this month, "Media Zionists Show Their Hand", which appears on page 5. That article dealt with some of the things the Zionist press lobby cum dirty tricks department has been up to of late. This column will deal in part with certain of the tricks some journalists get up to in order to serve their Zionist patrons.

Before I do that, though, I would like to anticipate possible complaints that my forthright anti-Zionist observations could be interpreted as being "anti-Jewish". The Zionists have such a grip over the media that in many, otherwise quite rational, peoples' minds, anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism have come to mean one and the same thing.

Nobody would for a moment interpret anti-Communist remarks as being "anti-Russian" or "anti-Chinese" . . . yet somehow Zionism — which like Communism, is a political ideology, NOT a race or a religion — is considered by many to be above reproach.

Naturally, the Zionists derive much satisfaction and benefit from having conned or bullied so many people to consider them, individually and collectively, as more infallible than His Holiness the Pope.

It is hard to eradicate this intellectual dishonesty from the minds of Gentiles, especially if one is Gentile oneself. It is therefore very useful when a Jew who is not only not a Zionist but also an anti-Zionist, has the courage, publicly, to break through the humbug and double-think barrier.

In a letter to *The Guardian* on 29th April, Marion Woolfson, who is Jewish, took to task the slavishly pro-Zionist Gentile journalist James Cameron. Marion Woolfson wrote:

" . . . Judaism and Zionism are not one and the same thing . . . although I am of Jewish parentage, because I am known to be opposed to Zionism, I am welcomed in Arab countries . . . "

" . . . Those who have the best interests of the Jews at heart would not suggest that to be a Jew and not be a Zionist is to find oneself in a dilemma. This is dangerous thinking indeed for the increasingly repressive policies of the Israeli Government . . . could well result in Jews outside Israel sharing in the opprobrium directed against Israel unless they firmly dis-sociate themselves from Zionism.

"They cannot, on the one hand, support Zionism (which founded the State of

Israel and categorically announces that all Jews are part of the State of Israel and that this State speaks in the name of all Jews) and, on the other hand, expect to be excluded from censure of actions which are carried out in their name."

There are numerous other Jewish people in Britain and elsewhere in the world who are not only not Zionists, but are anti-Zionist for they are fearful of the wrath that might be called down on the heads of all Jews (Zionist and non-Zionist alike) as a result of the corrupt, manipulative, parasitic and often violent actions of the world Zionist movement, the leaders of which, for propaganda reasons, falsely claim to speak for the whole of Jewry.

Merely because the vast majority of ordinary members of the Jewish community, at any rate in the Western World, have been stampeded and propagandised into supporting the Zionist cause does not detract from that fact or its great significance in any debate about Zionism and anti-Semitism.

Smear by Association Technique

When the Column 88 story broke in the *Sunday Telegraph* on 18th April the Zionists were not thoroughly pleased with themselves, even though it achieved the front page main lead position. The reason why was because they did not think that the *Telegraph's* Peter Gladstone-Smith — who has long specialised in "anti-Right Wing extremist" exposés — had put the boot in hard enough against the National Front by implying that Column 88 was supported by the NF. In fact, Mr. Gladstone-Smith made it clear that Column 88 is proscribed by the NF.

Factual reporting like that was not what the Zionist smear-mongers were after, so they got the former *Searchlight* Editor Gerry Gable on to the BBC *World This Weekend* radio news programme to turn on the smears against the NF. Gable's name was not in fact given out by the BBC man who interviewed him, "for obvious reasons" it was said.

I don't know what the "obvious reasons" might be. I do know that Gable has convictions for political thuggery and break-ins, and the *Searchlight* people did not want his past record to spoil their image of opposing "extremism". This is the reason why his name has been deleted from the editorial staff of *Searchlight*.

Even the BBC attempt to involve the name of the NF with Column 88 was not considered to be good enough, so 'The Boys' turned to their old faithful, *The Guardian*.

This time the hatchet job was done by Anne McHardy — who has stood in for Martin Walker on a number of occasions in the past when pro-Zionist anti-NF smears had to be concocted.

Some idea of Anne McHardy's style — which must have given her Zionist friends complete satisfaction — can be judged from comments which I made in a letter I have sent to the Editor of *The Guardian* — which letter, if not published, will be directed to the Press Council:—

"On 19th April you published a news report and an article by Anne McHardy, both of which dealt with a secret Nazi group. I looked for the name of the group in the news report, but it was not to be found. Yet in contrast to that omission I noted that Anne McHardy had contrived to mention the name of the National Front three times within the first three paragraphs of her 12 paragraph report!"

From this clearly incomplete and, to my mind, misleading news report I turned to the article where at last I learned that the name of the group the fuss was all about was "Column 88". For that I gave thanks to your headline writer and not Anne McHardy. In her 15 paragraph text she only mentioned the name of Column 88 twice (both times in the seventh paragraph) while she contrived to mention the name of the National Front seven times — including once in each of the first three paragraphs!"

Even more deplorable than this 'smear by association' technique was her statement " . . . the National Front has strong links with Ulster Protestants . . . " which unexplained and ambiguous remark was immediately followed by references to an alleged plan to help Belgian extremists holiday in Belfast where they would be provided with opportunities to kill people.

Did Anne McHardy give a moment's thought to the possible outcome of crude propaganda tricks of that kind? Can she not conceive what meaning might be deduced from her ever-so-cleverly juxtaposed statements by some bomb-happy fanatic . . . and what might be the outcome?"

It is noteworthy that despite her frantic desire to mention the name of the National Front as often as possible she did not 'phone NF Head Office to secure any information or even a token quote."

43,000 VOTES FOR N.F. IN LEICESTER

NF nearly topples Labour mayor!

THE National Front is extremely gratified by the performance of most of its local election candidates. The party's percentage of the poll in almost every ward which it has contested before has increased significantly, and a considerable number of encouraging first-time votes have also been achieved.

High spot for the NF this year was its campaign in the LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL elections. For the first time the party nominated a full complement of three candidates for each of the cities 16 wards - 48 candidates in all.

It was in Leicester that an NF candidate for the Abbey Ward, NRG Camp, came nearer than any other NF candidate to being elected. He won 1,654 votes (10.75%) only 63 votes short of being elected. This was also 96 votes short of unseating the Labour Lady Mayoress of the City.

The Leicester Branch of the NF mounted a really tremendous campaign in the city, and the results reflect the hard work of every one of our 48 candidates. Particular praise must go to the Leicester Branch Committee: Mr Anthony Reed-Herbert, Organiser; Mr Jack Calver, Chairman; Mr Graham Eustace, Secretary; Mr William Newcombe, Treasurer; Miss Marilyn Taylor, Activities Organiser; and Mr Alan Gresham, Press Officer.

Every attempt was made to smear the National Front during the campaign. Illegal posters sprouted throughout the city bearing the image of Hitler and "Vote for your NAZional Front Candidate"; Conservatives attempted to link the NF with the Nazis merely because Leicester Branch leafletted wards with a copy of a letter from the local Health Authority which revealed the danger of immigrant tuberculosis; even the Synod of Methodist ministers called a special Conference to condemn an NF anti-immigration leaflet as a "dirty, disgusting and deplorable document".

In spite of the unprecedented hate campaign against the NF, over 20,000 people in Leicester voted National Front. The total number of votes cast for the NF in the City was a magnificent 43,733. The total NF percentage of the vote was 18.54. In Abbey Ward, where the NF came within 63 votes of winning, the National Front won its highest percentage - 30.71.

The NF results in Leicester were as follows:

Abbey Ward Mr G. Camp, 1654 votes (10.75%). Mr G.E. Smith, 1567 votes (10.19%). Mr G.T. Vaughan, 1503 votes (9.77%). *Total percentage, 30.71.*

Aylestone Ward Mr A. Cartwright, 774 votes (3.71%). Mrs P. Cartwright, 742 votes (3.56%). Mr H. Sutton, 662 votes (3.18%). *Total percentage 10.45.*

Belgrave Ward Mr D. Gagin, 1466 votes (7.50%). R.L. Sutton, 1614 votes (8.26%). Mrs B. Turner, 1604 votes (8.21%). *Total percentage 23.97.*

Castle Ward Mrs G. Langlois, 435 votes (4.71%). Mr T. Rhodes, 460 votes (4.98%). N. Richards, 460 votes (4.98%). *Total percentage 14.67.*

Charnwood Ward Mr A. Reed-Herbert, 1016 votes (8.31%). Mr P. Ash, 1031 votes (8.43%). Mr D. Harris, 1046 votes (8.55%). *Total percentage 25.29.*

De Montfort Ward Mr A. Ashby, 800 votes (6%). Mr J. Walton, 805 votes (6.03%). Mr R. Whitehead, 849 votes (6.36%). *Total percentage 18.39.*

Evington Ward Mr K. Clifford, 1292 votes (6.53%). Mr G. Eustace, 1299 votes (6.56%). Mr G. Hammond, 1292 votes (6.53%). *Total percentage 19.62.*

Humberstone Ward Mr E. Bassett, 1333 votes (6.94%). Mr B. Calver, 1507 votes (7.85%). Mrs J.

Potter, 1248 votes (6.50%). *Total percentage 20.52.*

Knighton Ward C.A. Mills, 490 votes (2.40%). M. Preston-Carr, 416 votes (2.04%). C. Smith, 444 votes (2.18%). *Total percentage 6.62.*

Latimer Ward Mr G. Bull, 1391 votes (10.25%). Mrs M. Bull, 1291 votes (9.51%). Mr A. Mission, 1134 votes (8.36%). *Total percentage 28.12.*

Newton Ward Mr C. Madsen, 1024 votes (6.56%). A.E. Richards, 988 votes (6.33%). Mr W. Saunders, 969 votes (6.20%). *Total percentage 19.09.*

North Braunstone Ward Mr D. Ash, 663 votes (5.53%). Mr S. Carr, 646 votes (5.39%). C. Rhodes, 604 votes (5.04%). *Total percentage 15.96.*

St Margarets Ward T. Charnley, 811 votes (6.95%). Mr C. Harris, 820 votes (7.02%). Mr S. McCabe 735 votes (6.30%). *Total percentage 20.27.*

Spinney Hill Ward Mr A. Gresham, 582 votes (3.35%). Mr W. Newcombe, 602 votes (3.46%). Mrs C. Studdert, 601 votes (3.46%). *Total percentage 10.27.*

Westcotes Ward Mr F. May, 614 votes (4.53%). Mrs M. Newcombe, 635 votes (4.69%). Mr E. Stubbs, 527 votes (3.89%). *Total percentage 13.11.*

Wycliffe Ward Mrs E. Calver, 502 votes (4.57%). M.R. Saunders, 369 votes (3.36%). Miss M. Taylor, 423 votes (3.85%). *Total percentage 11.78.*

All praise to Leicester Branch of the National Front for this splendid effort. One more push next year and we could have NF Councillors in the city. Reaction to the magnificent NF vote was predictable horror from the establishment parties. Leicester Labour party secretary Gordon Parker said: "I'm utterly disgusted that so many can vote for a party of that nature. From now on we have to fight this menace in every way possible".

Another great effort was made by the NF in the BRADFORD METROPOLITAN COUNCIL elections. 21 candidates were fielded by the National Front for 22 vacancies, and the party achieved excellent percentages in many wards. The highest vote was won by Jim Merrick in Bradford Moor Ward, with 1018 votes (20.32%). The National Front won 9399 votes of the total 93,312 votes cast - 10.07% of the total poll.

Allerton Ward Mr D. Regan, 402 votes (7.41%). Wyge Ward Mr G. Lupton, 575 votes (21.30%). Laisterdyke Ward Mr C. Murgatroyd, 325 votes (13.38%). Odsal Ward Mr F. Harris, 376 votes (8.88%). Keighley Central East & South Mr George Wright, 288 votes (6.58%). Morton & Keighley North-East Mr S. Wood, 255 votes (8.23%). Bowling Ward Mr J. Dawson, 422 votes (17.58%). Tong Ward Mr S. Collins, 314 votes (9.44%). Bradford Moor Ward Mr Jim Merrick, 1018 votes (20.32%). Clayton, Ambler, Thorn & Queensbury Mrs S. Merrick, 514 votes (8.30%). Wibsey Ward Mr D. Brown, 411 votes (10.76%). Great Horton Ward Mr W. Thay, 473 votes (10.89%). Heaton Ward Mr A. Cureton, 431 votes (9.33%). Undercliffe Ward Mr D. Matson, 146 votes (12.60%). Eccleshill Ward Mr A. Farrow, 388 votes (9.69%). Idle Ward Mrs S. Matson, 383 votes (8.18%). Manningham Ward Mr L. Ramsden, 418 votes (11.08%). Keighley North-West & West Mrs A. Fairley, 321 votes (6.24%). Little Horton Ward Mr T. Cranston, 365 votes (11.19%).

In Bolton Ward, where there were two vacancies and only one NF candidate, Mrs E. Barszak did very well to poll 500 votes (7.71%). Thornton No.2 Ward Mr D. Brook 397 votes (5.54%).

All over the country, National Front candidates trounced Liberal party candidates in these elections and proved that the NF can replace the Liberals as the third party. In Bradford, Liberal candidates were beaten in Allerton, Keighley Central East & South, Heaton, Undercliffe and Keighley North

West & West Wards.

Very fine results were achieved by West Bromwich Branch in the elections for SANDWELL METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL. The Branch increased their votes significantly, and high percentages were achieved in almost every ward. Mr Ray Churms and Mrs Maureen Williams polled 21.34% and 21.22% of the total vote in their wards.

The results were: Greet Green, Mr R. Osborne, 252 votes (15.72%). Hateley Heath Mr R. Churms, 326 votes (21.34%). Hill Top Mr C. Allsop, 362 votes (18.05%). Horsey Heath Mr R. Edwards, 249 votes (13.64%). Tantaney Mrs Joan Jones, 280 votes (13.92%). Tibbington Mr H. Simcox, 370 votes (19.59%).

WARLEY, Tivdale Mr K. Jowsey, 506 votes (15.85%). Bearwood, Mr D. Liddy, 626 votes (20.35%). Bristnall Mr D. Smith, 512 votes (19.72%). St. Pauls Mrs Judith Jowsey, 383 votes (14.92%). Soho Mrs Maureen Williams 466 votes (21.22%).

In the elections for WOLVERHAMPTON DISTRICT COUNCIL, Wolverhampton NF contested 8 wards and beat Liberal candidates in four of them. The highest vote was achieved by Mr Eric Shaw in Spring Vale Ward, with 879 votes (20.7%). The results were: Spring Vale Mr E. Shaw, 879 votes (20.7%), Liberal beaten. Merry Hill Mr G. Oldland, 278 votes (4.5%). Blakenhall Mr J. Eyre, 346 votes (8.06%), Liberal beaten. Park Mr J. Thomas, 180 votes (4.97%). Eastfield Mr Ron Davison, 349 votes (13.19%), Liberal beaten. Parkfield Claire Simpson, 207 votes (8.1%), Liberal beaten. Wednesfield Heath Christine Thomas, 279 votes (6.91%). Wednesfield North Mrs M. McNally, 382 votes (9.32%).

Excellent results were also achieved by the NF in the elections for BLACKBURN DISTRICT COUNCIL. In Park Ward, where there were three vacancies and only one National Front candidate, Jim Pye achieved an impressive 11.29%, beating two Labour candidates and an NP splinter group candidate. A similar result was achieved in Trinity Ward, where Jack Wright fought for the NF in a ward with three vacancies and beat two Conservatives, a Liberal and Ind. Labour candidates with 10.99%. Considering that only one NF candidate fought against three from the main parties, these are really impressive results.

NP splinter group leader Kingsley Read was elected in St. Thomas' Ward, which represented, of course, an excellent vote for the National Front since the NF had promoted Read in two parliamentary elections and in his Race Relations case. Read was unopposed by the NF; since the NF beat the splinter group in the one ward where both contested, a National Front candidate would have foiled Read. Many voters have embarrassed local NF Organisers by congratulating them on the election of an NF candidate!

It is true to say that NF votes in the BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL elections were spectacular. National Front candidates doubled and tripled their votes on previous elections, in an area traditionally difficult for the NF. Most striking of all were the high percentages where only one NF candidate contested three vacancies. The results indicate the prospect of election in Bristol if all seats were contested by the NF. Bristol bombshell Mrs Josephine Dowler beat all three Liberal candidates in her ward. The results were: Knowle, Mr Ray Dowler 10.4%, a tripling of the previous election vote; Bishopsworth Mr K. Elliot, 7.2% in a 3 vacancy ward, a doubling of the previous NF vote. St George West Mr R. Pierce, 12.4% in a 2 vacancy ward, previous vote doubled. Somerset Mrs J. Dowler, 6.6% in a 3 vacancy ward, all three Liberals beaten. Windmill Hill Mr R. Jacklin, 8.7% in a 3 vacancy ward, previous vote doubled. Bedminster Mr R. Bale, 5.5% in a 3 vacancy ward. Horfield Mr P. Thomas, 5.2% in a 3 vacancy ward. As in all cases where one NF candidate stood in 2 or 3 vacancy wards, it is fair to assume a doubling or tripling of these percentages if all vacancies were contested by the NF, since the figures show very little cross-voting.

Leicestershire NF candidates also polled very well outside the city of Leicester. In the CHARN-

WOOD DISTRICT COUNCIL election three NF candidates contested the 4 vacancy **Loughborough Beaumont Ward** and polled 8.32% of the vote. In the **HINCKLEY & BOSWORTH DISTRICT COUNCIL** **Newbold Verdun Ward**, NF candidate Mr J. Ryde polled 13.62%. A very good vote was achieved in the **OADBY & WIGSTON DISTRICT COUNCIL** election, where two NF candidates Mr C. Smith and Mr B. Dalby fought the 3 vacancy **Fairfield Ward** and won 16.83% of the vote.

West Herts NF did well in the **WATFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL** elections, achieving good percentages with one candidate in three 3 vacancy wards. Results: **Central** Mr M. Smith, 9%. **Callowland** Mr J. Lear, 13%. **Vicarage** Mr P. Floyd, 17%. **Hemel Hempstead** NF polled 11.7% in the **DACORUM DISTRICT COUNCIL**, **Apsley Ward** election with three candidates in a 5 vacancy ward. Mr Laurie Nunn achieved 7.5% in **Farley Ward** of **LUTON BOROUGH COUNCIL**.

In Lancashire, **Accrington** NF won good percentages with one candidate in 2 or 3 vacancy wards in the **HYNDBURN BOROUGH COUNCIL** elections. Results: **Peelpark** Mr D. Riley, 10.12% (2 vac.); **North** Mr K. Dobson, 6.96% (3 vac.), and **South** 7.68% (3 vac.). As in the case of **Bristol**, these percentages can be projected by doubling and tripling to get an accurate assessment of the NF vote if all vacancies were contested. **Rochdale** NF fielded 3 candidates for **ROCHDALE DISTRICT COUNCIL** and achieved a highest percentage of 7.5 in **Central & Ealings Ward**. **Bolton** NF achieved 9.05% in the **Rumworth & Hulton Ward** of **GREATER MANCHESTER METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**.

In the **BLACKPOOL & DISTRICT COUNCIL** elections NF candidates won some good votes in 2 and 3 vacancy wards. Allowing for the absence of cross voting, one can project the percentages in the best wards if all vacancies had been contested as follows: **Bispham** Mrs F Shurrock 5.93% (11.86%); **Foxhall** Mr A. Hanson, 9.42% (18.94%); **Norbreck** Mrs F. Harper 5.07% (10.14%); **Thornton Cleveleys** **North** Mr R. Farr, 5.50% (16.50); **Breesall** Mr T. O'Donnell, 5.42% (16.26%); **Clifton** Mr E. Thompson, 4.95% (13.85%).

Results elsewhere in the West Midlands were not quite as good as those of **Wolverhampton** and **West Bromwich**. In the **BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL** elections where the NF fielded 13 candidates, the best votes were in **Fox Hollies Ward**, where Mr R. Warren polled 8.02% and **Saltley Ward**, where Mr R. Bloor polled 10.78%. Our highest vote in the **COVENTRY CITY COUNCIL** elections was in **Whoberley Ward** with 5.56%.

Similarly in **Yorkshire**, other results did not match our successes in **Bradford**. Our best vote in the **LEEDS METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL** where the NF fielded 10 candidates was in **Osmondthorpe Ward**, where Mr L. Sella polled 5.50%. **Huddersfield** NF fielded 2 candidates for the **KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**, where Mr W. Hales polled 6.83% in **Deighton Ward**. **Halifax** NF polled averages of 7% in three wards of **COLVERDALE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**.

The following is a list of our remaining candidates and best results. P indicates a projected percentage in multi-vacancy wards: **STOCK-ON-TRENT CITY COUNCIL**, three candidates, **Ward 12** Mrs J. Latham, 9.30%P. **GREAT YARMOUTH BOROUGH COUNCIL**, **Northgate** Mr T. Holmes, 16.90%P. **NORWICH CITY COUNCIL**, **Coslany** Mr W. Fitt, 6.36%P. **BURY METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**, **Radcliffe North** Mrs E. McBriar, 5.13%P. **TAMESIDE METROPOLITAN**, **Werneth** Mr F. Dawber, 7.13%. **PRESTON BOROUGH COUNCIL**, **Ashton Ward** Mr J. Skinner, Mr J. Massey 6.78%P; **Fishwick Ward** Mr W. Lamb 14.00%. **SOLIHULL DISTRICT COUNCIL**, **Lyndon Ward** Mr D. Sandon, 5.04%.

In the elections for **DARTFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL**, **Newtown Ward** our candidates **Ken Follett**, **Mrs Irene Nobbs** and **Gordon Price** polled 3.86%, a higher overall percentage than the NP splinter group candidates. **SPELTORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL**, **Stanwell Ward** Mr M. Braithwaite, 11.03%P. **SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL**, **Langley Ward** Mr A. Hetherington and Mr T.

Mundy, 4.21%. In the elections for **THANET DISTRICT COUNCIL** and **MEDWAY BOROUGH COUNCIL** in Kent our candidates polled averages of 6 and 7 per cent. The NF also fought two recent council by-elections: **RICHMOND BOROUGH COUNCIL**, **Mount Ward** Mrs V. Roberts, 4.3%, and **BASILDON DISTRICT COUNCIL**, **Pitsea Ward** Mr B. Weedon, L. Gardiner and Mr G. Dudley, 8.1%.

In these municipal elections the National Front has greatly increased its vote nationwide, in many cases doubling and tripling its support. From **Bristol** to **West Bromwich** to **Bradford**, **Blackburn** and **Leicester** the NF has achieved actual or projected percentages of 15 to 20 per cent and over, reaching as high as 30 per cent. As the **Leicester** results show, this rapidly growing support is the stuff of political power.

Bristol NF march against City debt



Eyecatching Bristol demonstration

The **Bristol** Branch of the National Front recently climaxed its campaign against the appalling loan debts incurred by **Avon** county and **Bristol** city with an eye-catching demonstration and the presentation to the Council of a 2000 signature petition. **Bristol** NF have campaigned solidly against the disgraceful city debt of £212,943,091 and loan interest charges of a staggering £12,300,847.

Children of local NF members carried a ball and chain and mock millstones around their necks as symbols of the debt burden. The demonstration was an excellent example of bringing home to local people the national economic policies of the National Front, with its emphasis on the abolition of the debt system of finance.

The NF petition was presented to the Council by a Liberal party councillor, to the enagement of the local Labour party who protested that the Liberals had obviously become the official spokesmen for the National Front.

John Tyndall to visit Rhodesia

John Tyndall, Chairman of the National Front, has been invited to visit **Rhodesia** and **South Africa** later this year. His travel costs will largely be met by individuals and patriotic organisations in **Rhodesia** and the Republic.

The announcement of the visit was made during the magnificent 'Stand by **Rhodesia**' rally held at **Conway Hall** on the 20th April, which drew 500 people and a splendid collection of £630. The promised mass mobilisation by the **International Socialists** to protest against the rally was a complete flop. Barely 60 bedraggled communists shuffled to **Red Lion Square** to shout obscenities outside.

It was announced at the meeting, addressed by **John Harrison-Broadley**, **Martin Webster**, **Andrew Fountaine** and **John Tyndall**, that the NF would be campaigning in the coming months to provide practical assistance as well as moral and political support for **Rhodesia**. Already, it was revealed, large numbers of patriotic Britons had contacted NF Head Office indicating their willingness to rally to the protection of their kinfolk in **Rhodesia**.

OBITUARY

Mrs Rose Weatherall

We are sad to report the death of Mrs **Rose Weatherall**, one of our most loyal National Front members. **Rose**, who belonged to the **Islington Branch**, was a hard worker in every sense of the word. In elections you would find **Rose** leafletting or standing for hours on end outside a polling booth. When the National Front was temporarily without an office during the recent party crisis, it was **Rose** who turned up tirelessly every day at **Theberton Street** in the freezing cold to further the cause she so fervently believed in. Never once complaining about the conditions she was working under, she did it all so willingly. A more unassuming, inoffensive person it would be hard to find. Humility, Patriotism, and unswerving Loyalty to the National Front were **Rose's** main qualities.

Death came to **Rose** violently, unexpectedly and in a most brutal manner, as she was attacked viciously and killed.

Not for **Rose** the dignity of a peaceful death, she who was so peaceful herself. If we could be as **Rose** was, never doubting, always undaunted and unswervingly loyal, what a credit we would be.

A small tribute to one of the unsung members of the National Front who will be sadly missed by all who knew her.

Message from the Chairman of the National Front

LAST YEAR, when the National Front was being subjected to a considerable amount of internal disruption and disaffection, I remarked to certain close colleagues that these troubles, instead of just 'happening', could well be contrived — deliberately promoted by our political enemies in order to divide and weaken us. Some of these colleagues thought at the time that my diagnosis was rather far fetched, then later came to admit that I was probably right.

I am referring of course to the development of what came to be known as the 'populist' faction: an element in the party which sought to promote the idea that we might grow more quickly and achieve greater success in elections if our policies were in certain places watered down and if certain 'hard-liners' were removed from the leadership.

In due course we successfully removed this faction from the National Front and thus ended, for the time being at least, the threat of serious disruption from that quarter.

What I want to warn members of now is that 'populism', i.e. a movement for the watering down of policies, does not represent the only danger to the integrity of the National Front. Those political opponents who are desperate to exploit potential factors of division amongst us are just as liable, having failed with one method, to try another. Having tried to 'get at' our members from one direction, they may well be seeking to 'get at' them from an entirely different direction.

Just as there exist within some of us yearnings for greater 'moderation' and 'respectability', there exist within some others of us yearnings — at least at moments — for greater militancy; an even more uncompromising enunciation of our policies and even more aggressive methods of promoting our party and opposing its enemies.

RIGHT BALANCE

There is nothing exceptionable in this fact, it is a fact of life in all political movements, which are after all comprised of different individuals with differing temperaments. It is up to

the leadership of any such movements to decide wisely just where the right balance between moderation and militancy lies and to persuade the rank and file to accept their rulings in this regard. The leadership of the National Front has this task and will not shirk it.

In all due humility, I do not think that I require any lessons from anyone on the matter of militant commitment to one's political ideals. I have more than once lost my freedom through such commitment and much more besides. So have some others among the senior leadership of our movement. Our record is worth contrasting with that of some other so-called 'militants' and 'hard-liners' who are always urging extreme courses but have never placed themselves in the front line of action when such courses have been pursued. Their 'militancy', such as it is, consists of attending private *soirées* at which they surround themselves with obscurantist regalia, tap the sides of their armchairs to martial music and defer to political leaders of a bygone age. The requirement for these activities is always that there is nowhere to hand anyone who is equally militant in the profession of an opposite faith and who might in consequence provide a threat to one's physical safety.

JUST PLAIN SILLY

I cannot warn National Front members strongly enough against this type of seduction. It is futile, time-wasting, counter-productive and just plain silly. Most of all, if they but knew it, it delights our enemies, who above all fear, not clandestine gatherings of cult-worshippers, but practical, businesslike political activity geared to winning political power in modern Britain.

It is indeed my observation that many of the people who succumb to the pull of these fringe groups do so precisely because they are temperamentally lacking in the qualities to apply themselves to regular activity of a practical kind. Building a power base in British politics of today requires hard work, intelligence, sound, efficient organisation and a preparedness to engage in activity that is not always glamorous and exciting — and all this over a

sustained period. The real and genuine 'hard-liners' are those who, while not sacrificing the strength of their inner convictions, are prepared to do just that. The people who seek escape from such activity into the politics of posturing and play-acting are not 'hard-line' at all; they are just political babies.

DISCIPLINE

There is another thing that must be said: Were some of these bogus 'hard-liners' and 'militants' really to examine the deepest tenets of their faith, they would realise that one indispensable virtue demanded of them is discipline. Were they to join certain parties, or live in certain societies, of the past which they profess so much to admire, and were they not prepared to abide by the rules of discipline, by the commands of their leaders, they would soon be for the high jump. How many of them would come up to scratch in such matters? From their record in our party, very few, for I have found that those who are loudest in their praise of past political movements and societies where discipline occupies a premier place are the least disposed to abide by disciplinary rules when they are established in the National Front.

Let me end by this caution to those amongst us who may be tempted by the superficial attractions of these fringe groups. At the end of the day, whatever one's ideals, there is absolutely no substitute for an organisation constituted to win political power in this country. The National Front is so constituted that it has a chance of doing this, given many years of sustained effort and intelligent political strategy and tactics. These fringe groups have absolutely none.

And one last thing: although most of the recruiting agents for the fringe may be sincere if rather foolish people, it does not mean that all of them are. If by disrupting the NF they are serving the cause of our enemy, think it not inconceivable that some of them may be doing so out of choice and out of design.

Think on these things, and close ranks — for we are Britain's last hope. JOHN TYNDALL

FIND OUT ABOUT THE NATIONAL FRONT

Send 15p for information pack.

Name

Address

To: NATIONAL FRONT
91 CONNAUGHT ROAD
TEDDINGTON, MIDDXX.
(Tel. 01-977 2452)

I enclose